230


LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
230
B997c



Christian Theology

Christian Theology

A Systematic Statement of Christian Doctrine for the Use of Theological Students

---

By

RUSSELL R. BYRUM

Professor of Systematic Theology in
Anderson Bible School and Seminary
Anderson, Indiana

Author of Shadows of Good Things,
Holy Spirit Baptism and the Second Cleansing,
Scripture Readings and Sermon Outlines, etc.

14265

LIBRARY OF
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
BT
75
.B97
C.1
14265

GOSPEL TRUMPET COMPANY
Anderson, Indiana

Copyright, 1925
by
Gospel Trumpet Company

Printed in United States of America

PREFACE

The purpose of this work is to set forth in concise and systematic form the evidences, doctrines, and institutions of the Christian faith. Much of what is contained in the following pages has been given to students in the classroom as lectures from year to year and in the form of typewritten outlines which I have used in teaching.

In preparing this work the aim has been to treat the subject with such a degree of brevity as is consistent with clearness and strength of argument. I have had as my object in writing, the production of such a textbook as I should wish to place in the hands of students in the classroom beginning the study of systematic theology, and also I have sought to adapt the discussion to meet the needs of the many ministers who must gain most of their knowledge of the subject through individual private study. I have also endeavored so to present the subject that even Sunday-school teachers and other laymen who seek to be informed in doctrine can, by a thoughtful reading of it, obtain a clearer view of Christian truth and a firmer conviction that it is truth. Certainly the truths of Christianity were intended for the average man as well as for the student and ought to be taught so all persons of ordinary intelligence can understand them. With this in view I have purposely avoided as much as possible an abstract style and technical terms, or when the latter are used I have often defined them. The omission of technical terms is also in harmony with the tendency of the more recent writers on theology, about one of whom it has been said that by him "theology has been freed from the bonds of a scholastic phraseology and taught to speak again an English pure and undefiled."

The subjects treated and the order of their treatment are such as are commonly found in a work of this kind. A theological writer can scarcely hope to say much that has not been stated in some of the many works of the past, but with the development of thought in each succeeding age a restatement of the truth is needed. New developments in science and religion require a change of emphasis in presenting the truths of Christianity. At the present time the tendencies to undue religious liberalism must be met by conservative Christian theology. As the deism of the eighteenth century and the Uni-

tarian defection of the last century were successfully met and overcome by strongly asserting and vigorously defending with sound argument the truths then attacked so it will be in the present conflict. And yet while we strive in defense of the gospel we do so with the happy confidence that truth will win, for men can not long deny those great truths that are fundamental to the needs of their natures and to their present and eternal happiness.

I have endeavored here to present the truth positively. I believe what I have here written, and my convictions grow stronger continually with the study and reflection of the passing years. I prefer to glory in believing so much rather than in believing so little, because God's blessings are promised to those who believe rather than to those who doubt and criticize. I have aimed at clearness rather than a flowery style. Inasmuch as theology can be comprehended well only by a practical application of its truths to the heart and life, I have freely employed the homiletical method in these pages. The attempt to present theology abstractly is not only unscientific but uninteresting and even sometimes repulsive to the truly devout heart.

I desire to express appreciation for helpful suggestions for the improvement of this work from C. W. Naylor, E. A. Reardon, and F. G. Smith, who have read it in manuscript form. I esteem their judgment highly because of their wide experience as practical preachers of the gospel and as writers on religious and theological themes.

With a fervent prayer to Him who is the source of all truth, and whose guidance I have constantly sought while writing the following pages, that by his blessing the perusal of them may be enlightening to their readers, this work is given to the public.

Anderson Bible School and Seminary,
Anderson, Indiana, December 6, 1924.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

BY F. G. SMITH

The very fact that books on religious subjects still form the largest part of the literature of the Christian world proves beyond all question the supreme importance of the theme; that it does not belong to the dim, distant past, but possesses within itself the germs of immortality. It lives forever.

Systematic theology, because of the nature of the subject itself, calls for frequent restatement. The religion of the Bible embraces in its scope that which is of supreme importance to our race. Men everywhere are called upon to accept it. Its doctrines relate not only to our origin and final destiny, but they make great demands upon us now by impressing the law of accountability upon the conscience. It is the special province of theology to make these doctrines and obligations acceptable to the reason. But the intellectual demands vary in accordance with the progress and thought-movements of the times. Thus change in the thought-sentiment of any age may require a change in theological emphasis. In other words, the same subject must be stated in a different form or approached from a different angle.

If a work on systematic theology had been written in the early part of the fourth century, when the Arian controversy was at its height, its author would have given greater attention to the doctrine of the divine Trinity than has any writer in subsequent ages. In a theology written during the period of the Christological controversies the Person of Christ would have come in for a more elaborate treatment. About a hundred years ago necessitarianism and free will were great topics of theological discussion. Every theologian of the time enlarged upon that subject, from a conviction either that it was necessary for him to argue at length for necessitarianism, or else that since he was free he should use his freedom by opposing it.

It is perhaps natural that every generation should consider itself vastly superior to all preceding ones. We now smile when we read concerning some of the theological controversies of the past. But the problems of that day were very real to the people of that day. We should also remember that the law of human progress and development is still at work, and some day others

who are faced with a different situation from ours will form their own estimate of our efforts to meet the problems of our day. So it becomes us to be modest. But these problems are real to us and we must meet them.

During the last half-century the work of specialists in geology, paleontology, biology, and other departments of scientific research has given rise to a new philosophy of life. This philosophy is gradually forcing its way from the institutions of higher learning down to our primary schools. It is already having its effect within the department of the church of today, and it calls for a fresh examination of the whole problem of theism and theology proper—the doctrine of God, creation, sin, divine revelation, and the relation of God to the world. This alone is sufficient reason for the appearance of another work on theology, a work adapted to the particular needs and demands of our time.

There is also another reason why we need a new treatment of the problems of theology. With all due respect to the efforts of past theologians, it must be admitted that most of them have labored either to create unique systems of theological thought or else to defend the particular schools with which they happened to be identified. Because of this particular bias it is practically impossible to point out a work on systematic theology that we can recommend unqualifiedly. We are now learning that no school of theology has a monopoly on the truth, but that elements of truth are to be found in all of them. We also see that the effort to emphasize particular doctrines to the exclusion of others, while effective to a certain extent in defending what may be believed to be true, is, nevertheless, not a very successful method of finding the whole truth. It is therefore evident that the only correct method in theology must to quite a degree be eclectic in character. It must bring together and unite in a systematic whole all the scattered principles of truth.

Another reason for the present work is worthy of particular mention. While as already intimated the older standard works on systematic theology are, on account of their particular bias, now unacceptable for general use, most of the more recent theologians show higher critical bearings and a tendency to capitulate to the demands of modern religious liberalism. We can not but regard this as a danger-signal. We believe that the great mass of Christian worshipers still believe in the substantial

character of historic Christianity and are firmly convinced that it has for its foundation eternal truth and verity. It is therefore fitting that a work on Christian doctrine, adjusted to the needs of our time, should now appear; a work soundly orthodox, committed to fundamental truth: God the supreme ruler of the universe; divine creation, the fall, redemption, divine revelation, miracles and prophecy, inspiration of the Scriptures; a superhuman Christ, miraculously begotten, crucified as an appointed offering for sin, resurrected from the dead by omnipotent power, and exalted to the throne of majesty in the heavens, from whence in due time he shall come to earth again, visibly and personally, to "judge the quick and the dead."

It may be appropriate to say a word also concerning what may not properly be expected in any new work on systematic theology. In the first place, a great degree of originality as to subject-matter should not be looked for. Theology has for ages engaged the careful attention of thousands of thoughtful minds. It would seem that truth has been approached from almost every conceivable angle and that the church has met almost every possible kind of heresy. The present-day author is therefore restricted, in that he does not have a fresh and original field of inquiry. At every turn he meets this sentiment, as succinctly expressed by another writer, "Whatever is true in theology can not be new: and whatever is new can not be true." He is therefore practically confined to a restatement of what has already been stated a hundred times or more. But as already intimated, there arises frequently the actual necessity of theological restatement. Causes operating both within the church and outside of it shift the points of chief interest and inquiry, and these call for new presentations of theological truth adapted to the particular needs of each succeeding generation. In meeting this demand, however, there may be the newness of additional emphasis and freshness in the individual style of presentation.

In view of the present-day conditions already referred to, the author has in this work given particular prominence to theism, apologetics, theology proper, and anthropology. It is not the ordinary doctrines of the Bible that are now made the subject of direct attack; it is rather the very foundations upon which the Christian structure rests. Another contributing factor may also be noticed. This work was designed primarily for a

text-book in the Anderson Bible School and Seminary. The author having in mind the general drift today toward modern religious liberalism, which subject is not adequately treated in other available books on Christian doctrine, has felt the necessity of a more particular emphasis on the foundation principles of the faith. In my opinion this is a fortunate choice, for he has thereby made a more valuable contribution to our department of theological literature.

The author is teacher of Systematic Theology in the Anderson Bible School and Seminary, Anderson, Ind. The present book is the natural outgrowth of his work in that institution. And while Christian Theology was designed primarily as a text-book for use in his theological classes, it need not and should not be restricted to them. My purpose in writing these lines is to introduce and commend it to a wider constituency. It is the product of patient, conscientious effort and is worthy of the careful consideration of students and of all truth-loving people everywhere.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

I. **Idea and Contents of Theology** 25
1. Definition 25
2. Religion and Theology 25
3. Main Divisions of Theological Sciences 25
4. Other Designating Terms Used with Theology 26
5. Uses of the Term "Theology" as to Extent 27

II. **Importance and Value of Theology** 27
1. Needed for Clear Conceptions 28
2. Needed for Strong Convictions 28
3. Needed for Intellectual Satisfaction 29

III. **Sources of Theology** 30
1. Nature a Source of Theology 30
2. Revelation the Source of Theology 31
3. Erroneous Sources of Theology 32

IV. **Method of Theology** 34
1. Need of System 34
2. Various Methods of Systemization 35
3. Method of This Work 36
4. Terminology 37

V. **Qualifications for the Study of Theology** 37
1. Spiritual Qualifications 37
2. Qualities of Mind 38
3. Educational Qualifications 39

Part I

EXISTENCE OF GOD, OR THEISM

Chapter I

ORIGIN OF OUR IDEA OF GOD

I. **The Knowledge of God as an Intuition** 43
1. Intuitions in General 43
2. Proofs that the Idea of God Is an Intuition 45

II. **Other Supposed Sources of the Idea** 48
1. From Animistic Superstition 48
2. Exclusively from Revelation 50
3. From a Process of Reasoning 50

III. **What Does This Intuition Contain?** 51

Chapter II

EVIDENCES OF GOD'S EXISTENCE

I. **The First Cause, or Cosmological, Argument** 52
1. The Law of Causation 53
2. The Universe an Effect 55
3. What the Argument Proves 56

II. **The Design, or Teleological, Argument** 56
1. Nature of the Argument 56
2. Evidences of Design in Nature 59
3. Objections to the Design Argument 63

III. **The Human-nature, or Anthropological, Argument** 65
1. The Argument Described 65
2. Argument from Man's Intelligence 66

3. Argument from Man's Freedom 67
4. Argument from Man's Moral Nature 67
5. Argument from Man's Religious Nature 68
6. Objections to the Human-nature Argument 68
IV. The Ontological Argument 69
1. Statement of the Argument 69
2. Theistic Value of the Argument 70

Chapter III

ANTITHEISTIC THEORIES

I. Atheism 71
1. Sense of Atheism 71
2. Unreasonableness of Atheism 71
3. Possibility of Atheism 72
II. Polytheism 72
1. Meaning and Origin of Polytheism 72
2. Different Aspects of Polytheism 73
III. Pantheism 73
1. Definition of Pantheism 73
2. Monistic Aspects of Pantheism 73
3. Defects of Pantheism 74
IV. Materialism 74
1. Antitheistic Character of Materialism 74
2. Fruitless Attempt to Account for Thought 75
3. Reasoning from Analogy Defective 75
V. Naturalistic Evolution 77
1. Evolution Hypothesis 77
2. Naturalistic and Theistic Evolution 79
3. Difficulties of Naturalistic Evolution 81

Part II

EVIDENCES OF DIVINE REVELATION, OR APOLOGETICS

Chapter I

PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS AND PRESUMPTIVE EVIDENCES

I. Proposition to be Proved 93
1. The Question Stated 93
2. The Incomparable Importance of the Subject 93
3. Present-day Task of Apologetics 94
II. Nature and Classification of Evidences 97
1. Probable, not Demonstrative, Proofs 97
2. Rational and Authenticating Evidences 98
3. Main Classes of Positive Evidences 98
III. Probability of a Divine Revelation 99
1. Possibility of Revelation 99
2. Necessary as a Standard of Right 99
3. Necessary for Pardon of Sin 100
4. Necessary to the Understanding of Providence and Prayer 100
IV. Marks of Divine Revelation to be Expected Characterize the Scriptures 101
1. Probable Contents of Divine Revelation 102
2. Probable Manner of Divine Revelation 102
3. Probable Attestation of Divine Revelation 102

Chapter II

EXTERNAL EVIDENCES

I. Genuineness of the New Testament 105

1. Method of Showing Genuineness 105
2. Genuineness Affirmed by Early Church Fathers 106
3. Genuineness Insured by Carefulness in Determining the Canon 108
4. Early Adversaries Never Denied Genuineness 110

II. **Integrity of the New Testament** 111
1. Evidence from Ancient Manuscripts 111
2. Corroboration of Ancient Versions and Quotations 112
3. No Material Change Possible 113

III. **Credibility of the New Testament History** 113
Credibility of the Gospel History Accepted by Those Familiar with the Events 114
2. The Writers Possessed the Requisites for Credibility 115

IV. **Miracles** 116
1. Possibility and Probability of Miracles 117
2. Possibility of Proving Miracles by Testimony 118
3. Proofs that Miracles Occurred 120
4. Proof of the Resurrection of Christ 125
5. Evidential Value of Miracles 127

V. **Prophecy** 129
1. Nature of the Argument from Fulfilled Prophecy 129
2. Objections to the Argument from Prophecy 132
3. Predictions Concerning the Jews 134
4. Predictions Concerning Christ 137

Chapter III

INTERNAL EVIDENCES

I. **Perfect Doctrines** 141
1. God's Being and Attributes 141
2. Man's Moral Responsibility and Freedom 142
3. Man's Depravity and Guilt 142
4. Man's Spirituality and Immortality 143

II. **Perfect Adaptation to Man's Needs** 144
1. Salvation from Sin and Depravity 144
2. Enlightenment and Comfort 145
3. Resurrection of the Body 145

III. **Perfect Morals** 146
1. A Perfect Standard of Right 146
2. A Perfect Measurement of Conduct 147
3. Perfect Practicality 147

IV. **Style and Incidental Allusions** 147
1. Unity of the Scriptures 148
2. Languages and Literary Style 149
3. Historical Events 150
4. Incidental Allusions 151

Chapter IV

EXPERIMENTAL AND COLLATERAL EVIDENCES

I. **Evidences from Christian Experience** 153
1. Nature of Experimental Evidences 153
2. Effects of Christian Experience in Consciousness 155
3. Effects of Christian Experience on Character 156
4. Effects of Christianity at the Hour of Death 159

II. **Effects of Christianity on Society** 160
1. Promotion of Universal Brotherhood by the Gospel 161
2. Domestic Relations Sanctified by the Gospel 162

III. **Rapid Spread of Christianity in Its Beginning** 163
1. Hindrances to the Spread of Christianity 162

2. Natural Inadequacy of the Means Employed 164
3. Rapidity of the Spread of Christianity Unparalleled 165

Chapter V

INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES

I. **Fact and Nature of Inspiration of Scripture** 167
1. Proof of Inspiration 167
2. Various Theories of Inspiration 167
3. True Nature of Inspiration 169
II. **Objections to Inspiration of Scripture from Alleged Errors** 172
1. Historical Errors 173
2. Scientific Errors 174
3. Moral Errors 175
4. Contradictions 176

Part III

NATURE AND WORKS OF GOD, OR THEOLOGY PROPER

Chapter I

THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

I. **Possibility of Knowledge of God** 179
1. God as an Object of Knowledge 179
2. Extent of Men's Knowledge of God 180
3. How God May Be Known 180
II. **Nature and Classification of God's Attributes** 181
1. Relation of God's Attributes to His Essence 182
2. Classification of Attributes 183
III. **Metaphysical or Non-Ethical Attributes** 183
1. Unity of God 183
2. Spirituality of God 184
3. Immutability of God 186
4. Eternity of God 186
5. Omnipotence of God 187
6. Omnipresence of God 189
7. Omniscience of God 190
IV. **Moral Attributes** 193
1. Holiness 194
2. Justice 196
3. Love 198
4. Mercy 202
5. Truth 203

Chapter II

THE DIVINE TRINITY

I. **The Doctrine of the Trinity** 206
1. Biblical Elements of the Doctrine 206
2. The Doctrine in Early Church Symbols 207
3. The Doctrine Stated 210
4. Mystery of the Trinity 211
II. **Bible Proofs of the Doctrine** 212
1. The Baptismal Formula 213
2. Paul's Benediction 213
3. Other General Trinitarian Texts 214
III. **The Divinity of Christ** 215
1. Divine Titles of Christ 216
2. Divine Attributes of Christ 219
3. Divine Works of Christ 222
4. The Worship of Christ 223

IV. **The Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit** 225
1. Personality of the Spirit 225
2. Divinity of the Holy Spirit 227
3. Procession of the Spirit 228

Chapter III

THE WORKS OF GOD

I. **God's Work in Creation** 231
1. Matter Created Out of Nothing 232
2. Creative Work Not Necessary to God 234
3. The Genesis Record Historical 235
4. Creation Days and Geologic Periods 237
5. Agreement of Moses and Science 241
II. **Creation and Evolution** 244
1. Evolution not God's Method of Creation 244
2. Evolution and the Scriptures Irreconcilable 245
3. Facts Reconcilable with Progressive Creation 248
4. Objections to the Evolution Theory 250
III. **God's Work in Providence** 253
1. Natural Providence 254
2. Supernatural Providence 257
IV. **Angels** 262
1. Existence and Nature of Angels 262
2. Good Angels 264
3. Evil Angels 265
4. Demon-Possession 268

Part IV

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN, OR ANTHROPOLOGY

Chapter I

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF MAN

I. **Unity of the Race** 274
1. Antiquity of the Race 274
2. Problem of Race Distinctions and Unity 277
3. Physiological Argument 279
4. Psychological Argument 281
5. Philological Argument 281
6. Biblical Argument 282
II. **Constituent Factors in Man's Nature** 283
1. Dual Constitution of Man 283
2. The Theory of Trichotomy 285
3. How Man is Superior to the Brute 288
III. **The Origin of Souls** 290
1. Theory of Preexistence 290
2. Theory of Creationism 291
3. Theory of Traducianism 292
IV. **The Question of Immortality** 293
1. Man's Body Created Mortal 293
2. The Soul Is Immortal 295

Chapter II

ORIGINAL MORAL NATURE AND STATE OF MAN

I. **Primitive Man of a Lofty Grade** 296
1. Constitution Relatively Perfect 296
2. Not a Barbarian 298
3. In the Divine Image 299
II. **Conscience** 300

1. The Discriminating Function 301
2. Impulsive Power 302
3. Retributive Aspect 304
III. Free Agency 305
1. The Question of Freedom Vital to Theology 305
2. Leading Theories of the Will 306
3. Proofs of Free Will 308
4. Objections to Free Will Answered 309
5. Real Freedom 312
IV. Original Righteousness 313
1. Nature of Original Righteousness 313
2. Proofs of Original Righteousness 315

Chapter III

FALL AND DEPRAVITY OF THE RACE

I. Original Probation 317
1. Probation Requisite for Moral Excellence 317
2. Positive Probationary Law Given 318
3. No Injustice in Adam's Probation 319
II. Origin and Nature of Sin 319
1. Nature of the First Temptation 319
2. Man's Fall and Its Effects 322
3. Nature of Sin 323
4. Sin Not a Divine Method 325
III. Nature of Original Sin 326
1. Sense of the Term 326
2. A Derangement of the Moral Nature 327
3. A Loss of the Holy Spirit 330
4. A Bent to Sin a Result of Depravity 330
IV. Extent of Native Depravity 331
1. The Question of Total Depravity 331
2. Degrees of Depravity 332
V. Proofs of Native Depravity 333
1. Expressly Taught in the Bible 333
2. Clearly Implied in the Scriptures 334
3. Ground for the Need of Regeneration 335
4. Universality of Sinning 336
5. Sinning in Spite of Restraints 337
6. A Natural Tendency to Sin 338

Chapter IV

MODE OF TRANSMISSION OF ORIGINAL SIN

I. Theories of Original Sin 339
1. Pelagian Theory 339
2. Augustinian Theory 340
3. Arminian Theory 341
II. Unscriptural Theories of the Transmission of Original Sin 342
1. Realistic Theory 343
2. Representative Theory 347
III. Law of Genetic Transmission 349
1. The Genetic Law 350
2. Men Are After Their Kind Morally 350

Part V

SALVATION THROUGH CHRIST OR SOTERIOLOGY

Chapter I

THE PERSON OF CHRIST

I. The Doctrine and Its Statement 355

1. A Vital Doctrine 355
2. Elements of the Doctrine 356
3. Creedal Statements 356

II. **Two Natures in Christ** 358
1. Complete Human Nature in Christ 358
2. Complete Divine Nature in Christ 359
3. Incarnation of God in Christ 359
4. Mode of the Incarnation 361

III. **Union of Two Natures in One Person** 362
1. Personal Oneness of Christ 362
2. Christ Is God-Man 364
3. Effect of Personal Union of Two Natures 365

IV. **Criticism of Christological Errors** 366
1. The Ebionites 366
2. The Gnostics 366
3. The Arians 367
4. The Apollinarians 367
5. The Nestorians 367
6. The Eutychians 368
7. The Lutheran Theory 368
8. The Socinian Theory 369
9. The Kenotic Theory 369

Chapter II

RECONCILIATION THROUGH CHRIST

I. **Preliminary Questions** 371
1. Offices of Christ 371
2. Sense of Reconciliation 371
3. The Fact of Atonement and the Doctrine 372

II. **Theories of Salvation Without a Reconciliation** 374
1. Impossibility of Pardon 374
2. Forgiveness by Divine Prerogative 375
3. Pardon or Repentance 376

III. **Biblical Statements Concerning the Atonement** 377
1. Christ Died for the Salvation of Men 377
2. Christ Died in Our Stead 379
3. Christ Died to Propitiate God 381
4. Christ Died to Redeem Men 383
5. Christ Died to Declare God's Righteousness 385

IV. **Reconciliation in the Old Testament Sacrifices** 387
1. Animal Sacrifices Typify Christ 387
2. Old Testament Sacrifices were Expiatory 388

V. **Elements in the Biblical Doctrine of Reconciliation** 390
1. Subjective Elements 391
2. Objective Elements 392

Chapter III

APPLICATION OF REDEMPTION

I. **Unconditional Benefits of the Atonement** 393
1. Individual Existence 393
2. Possibility of Universal Salvation 394
3. Salvation for Those Dying in Infancy 394
4. Power Requisite for Probation 396

II. **Conditional Benefits of the Atonement** 398
1. Salvation from Sin Conditional 398
2. Special Providence Through Prayer 400
3. Future Blessedness 400

III. **Universality of the Opportunity for Salvation** 401
1. Christ Died for All Men 402
2. Salvation Is for All Men 403
3. The Gospel Is to be Preached to All 404
4. God Wills the Salvation of All 404
IV. **Predestination** 406
1. The Calvinistic Theory 406
2. Election 408
3. Absolute Final Perseverance 412
III. **Human Conditions for Salvation** 414
1. Faith in Christ 414
2. Repentance 416
3. Obedience 417

Chapter IV
NATURE OF SALVATION

I. **Justification** 419
1. Sense of the Term 419
2. Forgiveness and Remission Included 420
3. The Basis for Justification 421
II. **Regeneration** 423
1. The Doctrine of Regeneration 423
2. The Ground of the Need of Regeneration 425
3. Nature and Effects of Regeneration 428
4. Possibility of Present Regeneration 430
III. **Sonship** 432
1. Children of God 432
2. Sonship by Adoption 432
3. Sonship by Birth 432
IV. **Consciousness or Assurance of Salvation** 433
1. Fact of Assurance 433
2. Nature of Assurance 434
3. Witness of God's Spirit 435
4. Witness of Our Spirit 437
5. Assurance in Relation to Doubts 438
V. **Holiness of Life** 440
1. The Sense of the Scriptures 440
2. Definitive Sense of Sin 442
3. Causes Leading to a Denial of Holy Living 444
4. Objections Considered 445

Chapter V
ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION

I. **Sense of Sanctification** 448
1. Other Designating Terms 448
2. No Specific Scriptural Sense 448
3. Its Sense as Here Used 449
II. **Need of a Second Cleansing** 449
1. Depravity a Ground for Twofold Cleansing 449
2. Depravity in the Regenerated 450
3. Distinctions Between Regeneration and Sanctification 553
III. **Proofs of a Second Cleansing** 454
1. Sanctification for the Converted 455
2. Sanctification for the Church 456
3. An Entire Sanctification 457
4. Coincident with the Holy Spirit Baptism 457
5. Two Cleansings in Old Testament Type 458

IV. **Nature of Entire Sanctification** 460
1. A Real Experience 460
2. Effects of Sanctification 461
3. A Definite Work 462
V. **Attainment of Sanctification** 463
1. Attainable in this Life 463
2. Conditions for Sanctification 464
3. Assurance of Sanctification 465

Chapter VI

BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT

I. **Nature of the Baptism with the Holy Spirit** 466
1. Expressions Representative of it 466
2. A Definite Experience 467
3. Distinct from Regeneration 468
4. Results of the Baptism with the Spirit 470
5. One Baptism but Many Fillings 471
II. **Gifts of the Spirit** 473
1. Nature of Charismata 473
2. Not Given Alike to All 474
3. When Spiritual Gifts May be Received 476
III. **The Gift of Tongues** 476
1. Nature of New Testament Glossolalia 477
2. Purpose of Speaking in Tongues 478
3. Post-Apostolic Speaking in Tongues 480
4. Not Evidence of the Holy Spirit Baptism 482
5. Proper Attitude Towards Speaking in Tongues 484

Chapter VII

DIVINE PHYSICAL HEALING

I. **The Fact of Divine Healing** 488
1. Scriptural Examples of Healing 488
2. Post-Apostolic Healing 489
3. A Present Reality 490
II. **The Reasonableness of Divine Healing** 491
1. An Aspect of Christ's Redemptive Work 491
2. Scripture Promises of Healing 493
3. The Divine Compassion 494
III. **Nature of Divine Physical Healing** 494
1. Definition of Divine Healing 494
2. God's Purpose in Healing 495
3. God's Method of Healing 497
IV. **Conditions for Healing** 498
1. Faith and Prayer 498
2. Anointing with Oil and Laying on of Hands 499
3. Attitude Toward Human Remedies 500
V. **Objections to Divine Healing** 502
1. That It Is Similar to Spiritualistic Healing 502
2. That There Are Failures in Divine Healing 503
3. That God Created Herbs for Medicine 504

Part VI

THE CHURCH, OR ECCLESIOLOGY

Chapter I

ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH

I. **Idea of the Church** 507
1. Sense of the Term 507

2. The Universal Church 508
3. The Local Church 509
4. Relation of the Church and God's Kingdom 509

II. The Fact of Its Organization 510
1. Theories of the Time of Its Organization 510
2. The Fact Stated and Implied in the Bible 512
3. Figurative Representations of the Church 513

III. Nature of Its Organization 513
1. Different Forms of Church Organization 513
2. The Church Divinely Organized 514
3. The Human Element in Church Organization 516

IV. Organization of Operative Agencies 518
1. Operative Agencies Needed in the Church 518
2. Relation of these Agencies to the Church 519

Chapter II

GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH

I. Officers of the Church 521
1. Classes of Officers 521
2. Pastors, or Bishops 523
3. Deacons 526

II. Nature of the Government of the Church 528
1. A Divine and a Human Aspect 528
2. Nature of Ministerial Authority 530
3. Number and Choice of Local Church Officers 531

Chapter III

APOSTASY AND RESTORATION OF THE CHURCH

I. The Apostasy of the Church 536
1. Two Aspects of Apostasy Predicted 536
2. A Rejection of the Teaching of the Word of God 540
3. A Rejection of the Rule of the Spirit of God 541

II. Sixteenth Century Reformation Partial 544
1. A Partial Return to the Bible 544
2. Human Ecclesiasticism Continued 545
3. Protestant Divisions 546

III. A Complete Restoration 548
1. Present Tendency to Unity 548
2. A Complete Reformation Predicted 551
3. A Return to the Scriptures 553
4. Rejection of Human Ecclesiasticism 554

Chapter IV

ORDINANCES OF THE CHURCH

I. Baptism 557
1. The Form of Baptism 557
2. Subjects of Baptism 570
3. Purpose of Baptism 574
4. The Essentials of Baptism 575

II. The Lord's Supper 576
1. A Christian Ordinance 576
2. Method of Observance 577
3. Purpose of the Supper 579
4. Erroneous Views 580

III. Foot-Washing 583
1. The Injunction of Jesus 584
2. Objections to Foot-Washing Considered 586
3. Significance of Foot-Washing 590

Part VII
LAST THINGS, OR ESCHATOLOGY

Chapter I
THE LIFE AFTER DEATH

I. Immortality of the Soul 595
1. Rational Evidences 595
2. The Teaching of Scripture 598
3. Theory of Conditional Immortality 601
II. The Intermediate State 603
1. Question of an Intermediate Place 603
2. Not a State of Purgatory 604
3. Not a State of Probation 605

Chapter II
MILLENARIANISM

I. Two Theories Distinguished 608
1. Postmillenarianism 608
2. Premillenarianism 608
II. History of Millenarianism 610
1. The Idea Among the Jews 610
2. Millenarianism in the Early Church 611
3. Modern Premillenarianism 612
III. The Kingdom of Christ 612
1. Nature of Christ's Kingdom 613
2. Predictions of the Time of Its Establishment 614
3. Christ's Kingdom Established at His First Advent 616
IV. Hermeneutic Principles 617
1. Literal or Figurative Interpretation 617
2. Historical Interpretation 619
V. Revelation 20:1-6 620
1. Millenarianism Not Taught 621
2. Exegesis of Revelation 20:1-6 622
VI. Objections to Premillenarianism 624
1. No Double Resurrection 624
2. No Restoration of Judaism 626
3. No Three Comings of Christ 627
4. No Great Tribulation 628
5. No Personal Antichrist 629
6. No Need, Time, nor Place for Millennium 629
VII. Premillenarians Questions 630
1. The Earth Full of the Knowledge of the Lord 630
2. Universal Peace, Blessings, and Prosperity 631

Chapter III
CHRIST'S SECOND ADVENT AND ITS CONCOMITANTS

I. The Second Coming of Christ 634
1. The Fact of His Coming 634
2. The Nature of His Coming 634
3. The Time of His Coming 637
4. The Signs of His Coming 638
II. The General Resurrection 639
1. The Fact of a General Resurrection 639
2. The Nature of the Resurrected Bodies 640
3. The Question of Identity 642
III. The Final Judgment 643
1. Truth of a Future Judgment 643

2. Nature of the Final Judgment 645
3. Object of the Final Judgment 646
4. Standards of the Final Judgment 647
IV. End of the World 648
1. Truth of the Destruction of the Earth 648
2. Extent of the Destruction of the Earth 649

Chapter IV

THE FINAL DISPENSATION

I. Future Punishment 651
1. Proofs of Future Punishment 651
2. Nature of Future Punishment 654
3. Place of Future Punishment 656
4. Duration of Future Punishment 657
II. Future Blessedness 660
1. The Truth of Future Blessedness 660
2. The Place of Future Blessedness 661
3. The Nature of Future Blessedness 662

Index 665
Index of Scripture Text Cited 675

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

I. Idea and Contents of Theology

1. **Definition.**—Theology is the science about God and of the relations existing between him and his creation. Such a definition is in harmony with the sense of the two Greek terms θεός (*theos*) and λόγος (*logos*), from which it is formed, and whose primary meaning is a discourse about God. It is the science of religion.

2. **Religion and Theology.**—Religion is man's experience with the supernatural, with his Creator, and it is so grounded in the constitution of man that he is always and everywhere religious. Theology is the intellectual aspect of religion. Religion is spiritual experience, and theology is the rationale and explanation of it. Religion and theology are related somewhat as are the heavenly bodies and astronomy, the earth and geology, and the human body and physiology. As the stars and the earth existed before man had any knowledge concerning them, so men are religious before they formulate theology, and believe instinctively before they reason. Not alone Christianity, but every religion has its theology. Whatever reason the most degraded fetish-worshiper has for his religious actions, that is his theology, crude though it may be. And from that degraded form of religion all the way up through all the great ethnic religions and including Christianity itself, theology, or the intellectual aspect of religion, is a necessity of the mind.

3. **Main Divisions of Theological Sciences.**—Theology in this broad sense is logically and commonly divided into four main divisions: (1) Exegetical, (2) Historical, (3) Systematic, and (4) Practical.

(1) Exegetical theology has to do with the interpretation of the Scriptures and includes the study of (a) Biblical introduction both general and special; (b) exegesis proper, or the interpretation of the sacred text itself; (c) special departments such as prophetical interpretation, typology, and Biblical theology. In relation to Christian theology as a whole, the function of exegetical theology is to provide the material from which the various doctrines are to be constructed.

(2) Historical theology treats of the development and his-

tory of true religion in all past ages and includes (a) the history of the Bible, or the record of God's dealings with men in revealing the way of salvation as set forth in the Scriptures; (b) the history of the church, or the record of events relative to Christianity; (c) the history of Christian doctrine, which is in the truest sense historical theology. This branch of theology also provides material that has a bearing upon a proper presentation of Christian doctrine.

(3) Systematic theology, which is next in logical order, is Christian doctrine arranged in a system. It is not only a systematic arrangement of the various doctrines of Christianity, but also a systematic presentation of the various elements of a doctrine showing the process of induction by which it is determined. It not only decides that logically the doctrine of God must precede the doctrine of sin, but it shows the reasons in logical order why we believe there is a God and sin, and the nature of each. The subdivisions of this main division of theology will be given later.

(4) Practical theology has for its foundation systematic theology, as the latter has its basis in exegetical theology. It has to do with the application of theology to the individual life and the propagation of it in the world. It is both a science and an art. It includes (a) homiletics, or the preparation and delivery of sermons; (b) Christian ethics, or Christian duties; (c) pastoral theology, which includes all other methods and means relative to the propagation of the gospel not included in homiletics.

4. **Other Designating Terms Used with Theology.**—Theology in its generic sense is also used with various other differentiating terms. Natural theology is used to designate that body of truths which may be learned from nature concerning God's existence and attributes, and concerning man's moral obligations to God. This knowledge includes not only what men actually learn direct and alone from nature without the aid of revelation, but also what may be so learned even though the facts are suggested by revelation. Many of the deeper truths of Christianity, however, can not be known from nature. Natural theology, then, is a classification in respect to its source, and is commonly so called to distinguish it from revealed theology, or that class of truths known to us only by the Scriptures. Revealed theology is also designated according to its source. Dogmatic theology is to be

distinguished from systematic and Biblical in that it usually is devoted to the setting forth of the doctrines of a particular school of thought or sect. It deals with human creeds as its material rather than the Bible, or at least is not limited to the Scriptures. Biblical theology is the study of those truths of theology furnished us by the Scriptures in the order and according to the method by which they are there given. It recognizes the progressive revelation in the Bible. As an example, if the Biblical doctrine of sin is to be studied it traces it through the various books of the Old Testament, through the sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, finds what John said about it in his Gospel and Epistles, and also traces it in the Epistles of Paul. It may thus trace a doctrine through the whole Bible or only in a particular portion of it. All true theology is Biblical, but in this technical sense of the term a particular aspect of Biblical study is described.

5. **Uses of the Term "Theology" as to Extent**.—The term "theology" is used in three different senses as to extent: (1) It is used in the broad generic sense to include all the various aspects of theology and larger divisions of theological science. (2) It is used in the restricted sense of the original ground-term to designate the study especially about the nature and works of God. This is often called "theology proper" and is but one of the subdivisions of systematic theology. (3) It is used most commonly to designate systematic theology. This is in harmony with our first definition and is doubtless the most proper use of the term, because the true science about God must describe not only God's nature and works but also all the relations existing between him and his works. Then Christian theology in its proper sense is synonymous with systematic Christian doctrine.

II. Importance and Value of Theology

To speak flippantly or contemptuously of theology is to do so of "doctrine," concerning which the apostle Paul admonishes Timothy to "take heed." This erroneous attitude is doubtless the result of abuses and error in attempts at theology and especially a reflection of that disposition of modern liberalism and free-thinking which would reject every divinely given standard of truth and exalt human reason instead. The devout and wise Christian will beware of such an attitude and also remember

that there are not only false theologies or doctrines, but also true Christian theology or doctrines from God.

1. **Needed for Clear Conceptions.**—The Christian minister or teacher especially needs a knowledge of theology. It is his message. He should know what is truth in order that on the one hand he may not omit the teaching of important doctrines necessary to the well-being of his hearers, and on the other that he may not add to the truth that which is erroneous. He needs such knowledge that his message may be balanced and consistent with itself. He must not emphasize one aspect of truth or of Christian experience to the excluding or obscuring of other equally important truths. The successful preacher must get past that mere fragmentary knowledge of truth and attain to a comprehensive grasp of it. The quality of the preacher's theology determines largely what will be the character of his congregation as a whole and the individual Christian experience of each member. The doctrine preached to and accepted by people is the mold in which they are made religiously. It is the faithful preaching of sound doctrine that has effected all the great reformations of the church. It is also that which will enable the church to maintain a high standard of religious life when it is once attained.

2. **Needed for Strong Convictions.**—And not only the teacher of religion needs a knowledge of theology, but every one will have firmer convictions of truth and be more stable in Christian experience if he knows the Christian doctrines as interdependent and mutually supporting each other. A bringing together of the teaching of Scripture and a careful study in the light of Scripture of any of the great fundamental doctrines of Christianity can not fail to strengthen faith and enrich one in Christian experience. Such study will clear away confusion and inspire to more earnest piety and service. It is true that in the early stages of such study doubts may arise as the mind is confronted with problems that were before not supposed to exist; but such doubts are not dangerous as they at first seem, but are necessary to healthful progress. A blind piety that dare not think is certainly not of the enduring nature that can give permanence to Christian character. Neither will theological study deaden the affections, as has been wrongly supposed, if it is properly pursued. If the truth learned about God and his will

concerning man is not merely held abstractly but applied to the heart and life, it can not fail to make one a better Christian. It has been well said that "the strongest Christians are those who have the firmest grasp upon the great doctrines of Christianity," and "the piety that can be injured by the systematic exhibition of them must be weak, or mystical, or mistaken."

3. **Needed for Intellectual Satisfaction.**—Man has not only an emotional nature, but also an intellectual nature. God is the author of both, and designs that man serve him with both the heart and the mind. In fact, one's emotions are largely controlled by one's thinking.

But the question may be asked: Why a scientific arrangement of religious truth? Why may we not receive Christian truths as they are set forth in the Bible, and save ourselves the trouble of theological science? The human mind is constituted with an organizing instinct. The normal mind can not rest in confusion of known facts, nor endure their apparent contradiction. The tendency to systematic thinking and arrangement of known facts is proportionate to the degree of one's mental culture and capacity. The mind is naturally so constituted that it must classify and arrange these facts of which it comes to know. God might have given truth in a scientific form instead of in historical form as it is set forth to a great extent in the Bible, just as he might have provided man food and clothes or secular knowledge without human effort. But work is a law of life throughout the whole creation. And in religion effort is needful, not only for the development of a beautiful Christian character, but also in order to an adequate knowledge of things divine. In nature, God has furnished facts which men classify and systematize and from which they make inductions of other facts and principles which constitute valuable knowledge. The starry sky supplies the facts of astronomy, but it was only by generalizing from many of those facts carefully gathered that the important principle of gravitation was discovered. Likewise, in the Bible and in nature God has furnished us the facts of theology. Now he expects us to arrange these facts in logical order, and by such arrangement, reconciliation, and comparison to clarify our knowledge of those facts and by processes of induction or deduction even to learn other truths. As an example, the Bible furnishes us the facts that the Father is God,

the Son is God, the Holy Spirit is God, and that these three are not identical, yet that there is but one God. These are the facts. Theology places the facts into proper relation to each other, and the result is the doctrine of the Divine Trinity. The doctrine of the twofold nature of Christ is likewise a product of theology, and was wrought out only after centuries of struggle. Still another reason for theology is that God has been pleased in the New Testament to supply us with parts of a system of theology already worked out, which is reason for believing he expects us to work it out still farther.

As in other fields of knowledge the mind can not be content with a multitude of undigested facts, so it is in theology. It has been demonstrated often that only as the mind knows Bible truth in logical order can it know really. This is the reason why in all ages and among all religious bodies systems of theology have been constructed.

III. Sources of Theology

The materials from which a system of Christian theology is constructed may be gathered from any source where they can be found. God himself is the ultimate source of theology, as the earth is of the facts of the science of geology. The two principal sources are nature and revelation. Nature is a mediate source and revelation is an immediate source of theological truths.

1. **Nature a Source of Theology.**—By nature is meant God's creation in its widest extent. We may learn about God, not only from physical nature with all that it includes, but also much may be learned of him from the spiritual creation as we know it in man's mental and moral constitution. Not only in lower forms of creation, but also and especially in man, who is created in God's image, may much be learned. And, again, the divine truth nature reveals to us, includes not only that from man regarded objectively, but also those truths that may be known through intuition, the logical reason, and the moral nature. The character of God may be known in a certain measure by what he has made, much as we may know somewhat about a man by the work that he does.

That nature is a proper source of knowledge concerning God is also directly stated in the Scriptures. "The heavens

declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world" (Psa. 19:1-4). Here the inspired writer asserts that nature teaches men about God and that such witness is perpetual though it is not given in articulate speech. The apostle Paul not only asserts this same fact, but also directs attention to the fact that the clearness of the revelation of God in nature is such that men's consciences are thereby obligated to serve him. "That which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful" (Rom. 1:19-21). A neglect of this important source of divine truth is a great loss. While revelation is far more important as a source of theology, yet the Scriptures are intended not to exclude but to supplement the facts we learn from nature. The reversion from nature as a source of theology by Watson and others is doubtless due to the undue stress on it by the deism, or "natural religion" with which they came into conflict. Both deeper love for God and a clearer knowledge respecting him is the inevitable consequence of a devout contemplation of his works in nature.

2. **Revelation the Source of Theology.**—However much we may study God in nature, yet it is evident that the truth there learned is incomplete and insufficient to enable us to serve him acceptably. It is here that deism unduly stressed the value of natural theology. The history of mankind is evidence enough of the insufficiency of the light of nature to show men the way to God. It failed to deliver the ancient Gentile world from its gross wickedness, and modern heathenism still testifies that even with all its elaborate philosophies "natural religion" has failed to save the individual or lift up society. Something more is needed.

The manifestation of God in nature needs the illumination of a supernatural and immediate revelation. This revelation must begin where the natural ends and tell more than can be

learned from natural sources. Nature makes known the existence of God, but revelation is needed that we may know his relations with men and how to serve him acceptably. Sin is a fearful fact that is evident in the individual heart and life and in the life of the race, but revelation is needed to make known the glorious truth of free pardon through the sacrificial suffering of a Divine Redeemer. Future retribution and life beyond this life is universally recognized because it is an intuition of man's nature, but what comfort can come from such knowledge if no divine revelation tells us how to be ready? Such a supernatural revelation is needed, and such we have in the Christian Scriptures. This divinely attested revelation is *the* source of theology.

Revelation is not necessarily limited to the Scriptures, as both before and since the Scriptures were given God has been pleased to reveal himself supernaturally to pious persons. Such revelation is desirable and needed under certain circumstances, but it is not valuable as material for theology, and because not divinely attested to men generally is not properly a source of theology except as it harmonizes with and supports the truth already revealed in the Scriptures.

Revelation is to be clearly distinguished from natural theology, not that its theology is unnatural, but to show that its communication is supernatural and direct. Nature and revelation have appropriately been called "God's two great books." God is equally the author of both. They are not contradictory, but complementary of each other. Nature is first in order of time, but revelation is first in importance; and except for the reality of the truths of revelation, nature would not be what it is. And with revelation, nature is a more fruitful source of truth than it could otherwise be.

3. **Erroneous Sources of Theology.**—The Roman Catholic Church holds her traditions, according to the decree of the Council of Trent, to be an equal source of truth or authority with the Scriptures. Doubtless in the period of the apostles the traditions of these holy men had certain value in this respect; but because of the corruption of the church resulting in a consequent corruption of the traditions, they certainly are not now, as represented by the Pope, a proper source of theology. Neither the decrees of the Pope nor those of any other individual or

company of men representing a body of Christian people are proper material for theology. Creeds, symbols, or confessions, both ancient and modern, even though such are formulated by the concurrence of every member composing a religious body, can not be admitted as a source of true Christian theology.

A second mistaken source of theology is mysticism. Mysticism claims an immediate insight into truth independent of nature or revelation. In relation to religious truth, it professes a direct and personal revelation from God. It is doubtless Scriptural and in harmony with the facts of the best Christian experience to allow such higher communication with God. There is a true mysticism that means much to the Christian in spiritual illumination and higher experimental knowledge of divine truth. But this is not an additional revelation equal to the Scriptures; it is usually only an illumination of that already revealed. In all the past centuries mysticism has not added any essentially new truth to what is known of God through nature and revelation. That false mysticism which pretends to add to the truths of Scripture various ideas, often unscriptural, that "the Lord showed" to the mystic, is to be rejected as a source of theology.

A third mistaken source of theology is rationalism. This error is the opposite of mysticism in recognizing too much of theology as from man while mysticism recognizes too much as coming directly from God. Reason in the broad sense has an important place in receiving and appropriating the facts of revelation. But that common modern tendency is wrong which would make mere human reasoning in the narrow sense the ultimate source of all divine truth, even to the exclusion of the truths of Scripture if those truths do not agree with previous conclusions of reason.

Is the inner Christian experience, or Christian consciousness, a proper source of theology? Every devout Christian recognizes the reality of Christian experience. He is aware of a remarkable change that took place in his soul at the time he accepted Christ and which has continued to be realized more or less vividly since that time. May he by a careful study of this experience know the essential nature of conversion? Often devout persons have accepted their own experience as a source of truth and preached it as a standard for all men, measuring all others by their own experience. But such standards are as

various as the number of those whose experiences they represent. Therefore, they can not be a proper source of theology. Another class who hold the Christian consciousness or experience as a source of theology are those too liberal theologians who assume that revelation was originally given only through experience, and not in words; that the truths contained in the Scriptures were originally the result of inner experience only, and that consequently truth may as well be learned from Christian experience today as a source of theology.

Doubtless Christian experience is corroborative of the teachings of revelation, and by such experience one can more clearly interpret the Scriptures. If one has experienced regeneration, he will more clearly understand the words of the apostle Paul, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." The Christian experience of an individual or of a particular age will necessarily modify the conception of theology for that person or age, but this does not mean it is a proper source of divine truth. It can not be a proper source, because of the variation already mentioned. This variation is due to one's natural temperament, environment, and to outside influence, and especially to the theology he holds. The Mohammedan's religious experience differs much from that of the Buddhist because their beliefs differ. Likewise the experiences of the Roman Catholic and Protestant are not the same; and as a result of varying belief, experience differs between Calvinists and Arminians, and between Unitarians and Trinitarians. Even with those holding the same general creed, experience varies according to their particular individual interpretation of their creed. Evidently, therefore, the law of Christian experience is that such experience is the *result* of Christian truth, or the individual conception of it, and not its cause; it is the offspring of theology and not its source.

IV. Method of Theology

1. **Need of System.**—Experience has furnished abundant proof that the truths of religion, like any other branch of knowledge, can be more clearly grasped by the mind if those truths are presented in a logical order. The constitution of the mind requires such presentation. Also by such systematic arrangement of theological facts it is possible to draw out general principles, and by such generalization to increase theological knowl-

edge. The results gained by such systematization are sufficient justification of it. And in view of this the ungrounded objections that religion is of the heart and not of the head, or that systematization makes for religious bigotry, need not be considered. The ancient theologians, including even such able writers as Origen, Augustine, and John of Damascus, who is commonly represented as the father of systematic theology, lacked system in their theological writings. And it is safe to say that as a result of this lack of orderly treatment there was a corresponding lack of clearness in their theology.

Two opposite dangers must be avoided in the arrangement of theology—oversystematizing on the one extreme, and fragmentariness on the other. Oversystematizing has been a not uncommon fault of modern theology and has placed an unnecessary burden of repetition and speculation upon it. In an attempt to make a perfectly balanced system, writers on the subject have yielded too often to the temptation to resort to speculation to fill up in their systems the gaps that resulted from a lack of revealed truth on certain subjects, such as the nature of the Divine Trinity or of events at the second advent of Christ. Others in endeavoring to keep away from this danger have fallen into the opposite one of treating the subject in a fragmentary manner that fails to satisfy the mind and to exhibit many truths that may be known.

2. **Various Methods of Systematization.**—A great variety of methods of arrangement have been followed in the treatment of theology. The order of presentation of the different parts of theology is determined largely by the type of mind of the writer. But especially is it determined by the particular aspect of the subject to be emphasized. There is nothing in the nature of the subject to require oneness of method in systematizing the doctrines of theology. Those who follow the analytic method of Calixtus begin with the idea of blessedness, the assumed end of all things, and reason to the means of securing it. Others, including Chalmers, begin with sin, man's disease, and reason to the remedy. Others approach the subject from still other angles and by other processes. The purpose of many theologians of the past and present has been to find one doctrine or principle out of which all others may be developed. Doubtless no such unity is possible. The inductive, not the deductive, is the true

method of theology. Theology must be constructed from the various elements to be found in nature and revelation, and can not be deduced from one general principle or doctrine, whether that doctrine be Christ, sin, blessedness, or any other.

3. **Method of This Work.**—The most common order of treatment of theology, and the one followed in this work, may be properly termed the synthetic method. It consists in bringing together the various elements of theology and arranging them into a logical whole. This mode of treatment is in conformity with the nature of the subject. The order of the larger divisions of this work, beginning with God and passing to the consideration of events at the final consummation, is not only a logical order, but to a considerable extent the chronological one. The order of this work is as follows:

I. Introduction.
II. Existence of God, or Theism.
III. Evidences of Divine Revelation, or Apologetics.
IV. Nature and Works of God, or Theology Proper.
V. Doctrine of Man, or Anthropology.
VI. Salvation through Christ, or Soteriology.
VII. The Church, or Ecclesiology.
VIII. Last Things, or Eschatology.

It is probably sufficient as an apology for this division and arrangement of the subject that it is clear and logical, and designed to give a degree of prominence and emphasis to the various leading phases of theology that will be helpful to a comprehensive grasp of it. Also these divisions in this order do not vary greatly from that followed by the majority of the most respected theological writers of the present day, as shown by the following lists of the main divisions of those named.

Strong: (1) Prolegomena. (2) Existence of God. (3) The Scriptures. (4) The Nature, Decrees, and Works of God. (5) Anthropology. (6) Soteriology. (7) Ecclesiology. (8) Eschatology.

Raymond: (1) Apologetics. (2) Theology Proper. (3) Anthropology. (4) Soteriology. (5) Eschatology. (6) Ethics. (7) Ecclesiology.

Hodge: (1) Introduction. (2) Theology Proper. (3) Anthropology. (4) Soteriology. (5) Eschatology.

Miley: (1) Theism. (2) Theology. (3) Anthropology.

(4) Christology. (5) Soteriology. (6) Eschatology.

Shedd: (1) Theological Introduction. (2) Bibliology. (3) Theology. (4) Anthropology. (5) Christology. (6) Soteriology. (7) Eschatology.

In the present work the results sought seem to require as many main divisions as are made of the subject. A certain recent writer strongly criticises the discussion of the divine revelation after theism, as is done by Strong, on the ground that it logically precedes theology and belongs in the introduction. In reply it may be reasoned that it is logical to show there is a God before the notion of a revelation from him can be given consideration. Certainly the vital importance of the proofs that the Scriptures are a divine revelation and the present controversy on the question are reason enough for the prominence given apologetics here.

4. **Terminology.**—Theological writers of the past have been much given to the use of technical terms of Greek origin, and as a result their works have been forbidding to the uneducated person. The leading writers of the present generation, however, have, almost without exception, reverted to simple, every-day terminology, which is certainly a great gain. Doubtless the technical terms have the advantage of definiteness in their favor, and are preferable from the strictly scientific viewpoint; but the simpler terms are desirable for practical purposes, and the practical end of theology must not be lost sight of. The word "man" is a better term than "anthropology," and "salvation" than "soteriology." In this work the main divisions are designated with simple descriptive terms, and to these are added the technical terms to furnish whatever superior definiteness attaches to them and to explain and to be explained by the simpler designation.

V. Qualifications for the Study of Theology

1. **Spiritual Qualifications.**—Probably the most important qualification for the study of theology is a pious spirit, even though it is not the only one needed. Nothing can take the place of a personal experimental acquaintance with God and a sincere desire to please him. Only to one with such an attitude of heart does God reveal his truth. Jesus said, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." To know the science about God as

it ought to be known one must know God himself, and this is possible only by experience. A mind unsympathetic toward truth can not understand the truth. It is here that the destructive critics of the Bible have so commonly failed as experts in that in which they assumed to be authority. Rightly to understand regeneration one must have been regenerated. To know the nature of the Holy Spirit baptism one must have been baptized with the Holy Spirit. Not that experience is the source of truth, but such experience does mean much for a proper conception of that truth revealed in the Scriptures. And especially does one need the enlightenment of the Spirit of God. "For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. . . .The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God."

2. Qualities of Mind.—Every one may profitably study theology, but all are not equally endowed with those native and acquired qualities of mind that are especially valuable in such study. The successful study of theology requires not only a devout heart, but a well-balanced and thoroughly disciplined mind. Because theology has to do with the greatest subject in the universe, it is deserving of the thought of the most powerful intellects. The student of theology needs mental equilibrium. He must be able to reason well, to discern relations clearly, and to move accurately from premise to conclusion. Also he needs keen insight and careful discrimination. While it is true that "the wayfaring men, though fools" may experience Christianity, yet a keen mind is needed to grasp the deep and sometimes abstract things of God. A trained mind is needed, as only such a mind can gather together and hold in its grasp many facts at once, and suspend judgment in the drawing out of general principles until mature consideration of all the elements in each is given. Also not only a logical mind is needed but a well-developed power of intuition is needed. Certain first truths, such as the existence of God or the reality of the future life, can be known better by intuition, or the mind's primitive convictions, than by processes of demonstration or logic.

Other qualities of mind needed are love for truth, sincerity, reverence, humility, candor, patience, loyalty to facts, and the courage of one's convictions. Love for truth will keep one from the opposite extremes of conservatism and progress. Extreme conservatism makes much of the "old paths" whether they are

right or not, and persistently holds to the way in which it happens to be even though the Spirit of God is endeavoring to lead into a richer and deeper spiritual life than that yet attained. It prizes the truth already gained and has the advantage of a settled state, but this is done at the expense of progress into a clearer light and truth, and also it leads into undesirable dogmatism. The extremely progressive attitude is also equally dangerous in causing one to cast away tried and tested truths that have been bequeathed as a sacred treasure by godly men of the past for what seems to be truth but is not. But proper love for truth will lead one to seek for greater light and at the same time cause him to hold fast all that he has received that is really truth.

3. **Educational Qualifications.**—A thorough knowledge of the Bible is of first importance to the study of Christian theology. Biblical theology must precede systematic theology. One must first know his Bible as to its contents. This will enable him to gather together the various facts of Scripture bearing on a subject. Next he must know the meaning of his Bible. If he misinterprets the meaning of the statements of Scripture he will probably fail to formulate sound doctrines from them. He should also be familiar with the history of Christian doctrine, as it has been held in past ages and as it is held by those of his own time. Without such knowledge he is liable to commit himself to a theory that has been exploded centuries ago. A familiarity with the original languages of the Scripture will be found of great value in interpreting it.

Nor will the student of theology find knowledge of secular branches amiss. A knowledge of history, philosophy, and human nature is valuable. Especially does he need to study physical science as well as mental science, as from these modern infidelity under the cloak of science is attacking Christianity and the theologian must be prepared to defend the truth. He should also be familiar with the life and spirit of his own times if he would successfully refute the current errors and adapt his message to those to whom he speaks. This means he must not be a recluse, but one who knows the thoughts of the living as well as the writings of the dead. To know people one must mingle with them. Without such association to give freshness to one's thought one is almost certain to become stagnant and abstract in his thinking.

PART I

EXISTENCE OF GOD, OR THEISM

PART I

EXISTENCE OF GOD, OR THEISM

CHAPTER I

ORIGIN OF OUR IDEA OF GOD

The "existence of God" as used here means the existence of the Infinite Person, the creator and sustainer of all things. The term "theism" is commonly used in this sense and has more definite meaning than the expression "existence of God." By the latter expression is too often meant a pantheistic or other conception of God than that which is revealed in the Scriptures, and which is characteristic of Christianity.

Belief in God has been common to men in all ages, nations, and conditions of life. It is practically universal. It has been and is as widespread as religion, and necessarily so, because it is fundamental to religion. There can be no religion in the exact sense of the term without the idea of God, even though that idea may be much perverted.

But how came this universal idea of God? If to a particular person were proposed the question of how the idea of God first came into his mind he would probably be unable to tell. It was there from the time of his earliest recollection, though possibly not so clear or in a form so highly developed as he later came to hold. The most important theories of the origin of the idea of God are: (1) that it is an intuition, (2) that it is from reasoning, (3) that it is by an original divine revelation handed down by tradition.

I. The Knowledge of God as an Intuition

1. **Intuitions in General.**—By intuitions we mean that sort of knowledge that is due to that inherent energy of the mind that gives rise to certain thoughts and which is differentiated from knowledge gained by instruction from without, by reasoning, or by experience. The term is used to designate the source of the knowledge as well as the ideas themselves. Intuitions are also known as first truths, truths of the primary reason, and innate knowledge. Intuitive knowledge is not ideas or knowledge which the infant finds himself in conscious possession of at birth, but

rather ideas that have their birth in the mind spontaneously when the proper conditions occur to give rise to them. "A first truth is a knowledge which, though developed on occasion of observation and reflection, is not derived from observation and reflection."—A. H. Strong. The mind is so constituted that its nature is to recognize certain things as being true without proof or instruction. And "there is nothing surer in psychology than the intuitive faculty."

Intuitions belong to the three departments of (1) the senses, (2) the understanding, (3) the moral nature. Common examples of them are time, space, substance, causation, moral responsibility, self, God. To these might also be added as further illustrations other ideas obtained intuitively, as beauty, that things equal to the same thing are equal to one another, that the whole is equal to the sum of all its parts. These things are perceived by the mind to be true as soon as they are presented, without any logical processes, demonstration, or instruction from without. One does not need to be told there is space. On the occurrence of the appropriate occasion the mind at once leaps to the conclusion that space is a reality and necessary—it could not but be. Probably many persons have never reasoned about the necessity of space, yet they have believed space a reality from early infancy and act upon it every time they use a measuring rule. And what is true of space is also true of substance. Many adults have never reasoned that substance is a reality nor felt the need of such reasoning. They know intuitively that substance is, and act on their conviction continually in every use of the senses. Men need not be taught the actuality of time. Duration, like space, can not but be. When the proper conditions occur to give rise to the idea, men simply know time is and act on that knowledge; hence they own clocks and watches. Causality, or the idea that every effect has a cause, is likewise self-evident, and the common sense of mankind has always affirmed it to be true. Only in philosophical speculation is this and other intuitive truths denied. So likewise psychologists refer all necessary ideas and truths to intuition. The great moral truths of God, moral obligation, and future existence are also intuitively known, and are questioned only when the mind is influenced by speculative theories.

It is not affirmed here that innate ideas are always con-

sciously held as true. The idealist who denies the actuality of matter yet acts on the fact of his intuitive belief in the reality of matter. He can not do otherwise. Men perceive and act on the great truths of intuition that are necessary to their very being without first reasoning about them. They are, in fact, necessary to reasoning and too important to man's welfare to be left to a process so uncertain as fallible human reasoning. The simplest act requires the assumption of important truths. When I take up my pen to write I manifest belief in (1) substance, of which the pen consists; (2) space, in which that substance is; (3) self, as distinguished from externality, without which I can not take the pen; (4) time, without which change of relation to the pen is impossible; and (5) causation, or self-determination, without the fact of which it would be impossible to attempt this or any other accomplishment.

The reality of intuitive knowledge is evident from what thus far has been stated. From these more generally recognized intuitions we may learn those characteristics or criteria by which we may in turn test those other truths whose intuitive character is questioned. These criteria of all intuitions then, upon careful consideration, will be found to be two—universality and necessity. In the nature of things, these are inclusive of each other. If a matter be necessary of belief, it must be a universal belief. On the other hand, if an idea is universally believed and acted upon it must be because no man can reasonably call it in question.

2. Proofs that the Idea of God Is an Intuition.—In affirming that the knowledge of God is innate, let it not be supposed that a complete apprehension of God in all his perfections as described in the Scriptures is possible by this means. It is here affirmed only that the idea of a superior being on whom we are dependent and to whom we are responsible is an intuition. Doubtless this original idea of God needs to be and may be vastly broadened and given more definiteness by reasoning concerning it, but only by a supernatural revelation can we have accurate knowledge of him. Let us test the idea of God as being an intuition by applying the test of universality and necessity, the criteria of innate ideas.

(1) *Universality of the Idea of God.*—What is the proof that the idea of God is universal? It is a fact of history that

the vast majority of the race have been religious, and acknowledged thereby their belief in a superior being or beings. This is a matter of common knowledge, and so much so that proof is superfluous. Belief in God has been characteristic of the ancient Egyptians, the Babylonians, Syrians, Phenicians, Greeks, Romans, all European nations past and present, the inhabitants of the populous countries of the Far East, the American Indians, and the African negroes.

But it is objected that whole tribes have been found by travelers and missionaries which were so degraded that they seemed to possess no idea of God whatever. In answer it may be said that these very tribes who seemed on slight acquaintance to be entirely destitute of the idea of God, upon further investigation were found to hold it. And it is not unreasonable to suppose that this will always be found to be true of all such which at first are seemingly atheistic tribes. In some instances missionaries have labored for years among a very degraded people before they found traces of a general belief in the supernatural, due to the natives shrinking from making known to strangers those mysteries which they held sacredly secret.

But suppose such an ignorant and degraded tribe of atheists were found to exist? Would such an exception be proof that the mass of mankind in the normal condition are also thus ignorant? Or if a tribe of idiots should be discovered, would their existence prove that reason is not normal to mankind? Would it not rather be assumed that the extreme degradation of such a tribe had resulted in their losing the use of an important and essential part of human nature? Does the fact that some men are born deaf disprove the sense of hearing as normal to men? Or does the frequency of infanticide among a people disprove the reality of parental affection?

Again, it is objected that some persons born deaf and blind affirm that they had no knowledge of God until taught concerning him. It seems scarcely possible that such persons should have been void of any feeling of moral obligation, and this implies the idea of God in a measure. Doubtless they had no such conception of God as they came to have in the light of divine revelation, and in comparing their lack of knowledge of God with what they afterward came to have they assumed they were entirely without an idea of God in early life. Also the argu-

ment of the preceding paragraph applies here, that the ignorance of a few such persons no more proves that the vast majority of them are without a normal intuitive knowledge of God than to suppose that a few idiots blind and deaf from birth would disprove rationality as normal in persons born without the senses of sight and hearing.

Or again, it is objected to the doctrine that the idea of God has its source in intuition, that there are men here and there, even educated men in a few instances, who are professed atheists. The unreasonableness and absurdity of holding atheism will be shown later, but here it may be said that it is only by philosophical speculation that one may have such views. It no more disproves the intuitive knowledge of God than the intuition of substance is disproved by the fact that a certain class of philosophers deny its reality when holding idealism, or than the intuition of free will is disproved by the denial of it on the part of those whose false philosophy requires them to hold necessitarianism. With the proof of the universality of the idea of God it is shown to meet the first criterion of intuitions.

(2) *Necessity of the Idea of God.*—Proof of the universality of the idea of God is essentially proof that the idea of God is also necessary as the cause of its universality. It is true that a few persons do, in contradiction to the laws of their nature, deny the being of God; but such denial is always forced and can be only temporary. It is only when under the influence of a false philosophical theory that the mind can thus go contradictory to its nature, but as soon as that theory is out of the mind it will naturally revert to its intuitive conviction of God as surely as the pendulum when unconstrained hangs perpendicularly to the horizon. And as the pendulum may be caused to vary from a perpendicular position by holding a powerful magnet near it, so intuitions are perverted by unsound theories. That the idea of a personal God is necessary to man has been well demonstrated in the history of certain of the great world religions. Buddhism was atheistic in its creed as originally held, and Hinduism is likewise pantheistic. But their millions of devotees are human, and this primitive conviction in them that God is and that he is a person is so strong that in spite of their creeds they have ever acted out that conviction. The divinely implanted tendency to pray has been so irresistible that

they can not refrain from it. In fact, Buddhists have been compelled to modify those very atheistic tenets of their faith because they were lacking in correspondence with a great demand of human nature. This alone is sufficient proof that the idea of God is necessary, which is the second criterion of intuitions and therefore proof that the idea of God is an intuition. Psychologists refer all necessary truths to intuition.

(3) *The Bible Assumes It.*—The Scriptures nowhere attempt the proof of the existence of God. It is assumed as being a truth already known and accepted. The opening verse of the Bible names God as the Creator, but does not wait to introduce him. Doubtless this is due to both the inspiring Spirit and the wise human writer recognizing the superfluity of such an introduction. This reasoning from the Scriptures to prove the innate knowledge of God will have no value, of course, in proving his existence to an unbeliever except as corroboration of proofs from other sources, but it is important to believers in the divine revelation not only as corroboration but as proof of the universality of such knowledge by the assumption of so important a fact by the Scriptures.

(4) *Its Importance Requires It.*—Also it is altogether reasonable to infer that the idea of God is a first truth because of its vast importance in determining moral obligation and for man's present and eternal welfare. As Robespierre said, "If God did not exist, it would behoove man to invent him." If the idea of God were not an intuition, it ought to be. That the knowledge of a matter of such vast consequence should be left to the uncertainties of educational processes, or should be a mere accident of the mind's circumstances, is inconceivable. The only proper original source of the knowledge of God is in the constitution of the mind itself. The idea of God must be available to all alike, and not possible merely to those who are so fortunate as to be taught about him, or whose rational powers are sufficiently developed to arrive at such knowledge by logical processes.

II. Other Supposed Sources of the Idea

1. **From Animistic Superstition.**—Animism is that form of superstition, common to the more degraded portions of the race, which believes that certain rocks, trees, streams, springs, caves,

etc., are animated or inhabited by spirits which must be worshiped and which will do injury to those who neglect such worship. The spirits which these barbarous people fear and worship are their gods, and animism is therefore closely related to their religion. Naturalistic evolution and other antitheistic philosophies refer the origin of religion and of the idea of God to such animistic superstition, and on the theory that even religion is the result of a process of evolution. They assume that animism was common to primitive man, that from that superstitious fear of spirits which he supposed dwelt in these various material objects he came to worship many idols in the forms of various images, etc., that with increased culture he evolved a higher polytheism, and that from this came the monotheistic idea of a Supreme Being. That this is the theory as held by those classes of philosophers mentioned is evident from the statement of E. B. Taylor in "Primitive Culture," "Animism is . . . the groundwork of the philosophy of religion."

At this point it may be well to state that we have no sympathy with this theory. Our objection to such an origin of the idea of God is not only because it is contradictory to the teaching of the Scripture, but, and especially, because it is not true to the plain facts of the earliest history of the race. From the history of religion it is clear that the tendency of religion is to degenerate rather than to rise to a purer form. Such has been true of the various great ethnic religions. Such has also been true of the true religion. Ancient Israel were continually departing from the exalted form of worship given them by Moses. And even Christianity has ever struggled against the degenerating tendencies with which it has come in contact, which are doubtless to be accounted for on the ground of depraved human nature. The theory that our idea of God came by a process of evolution from a primitive fear of imaginary spirits in material inanimate objects is a mere *a priori* assumption.

What does the actual history of religions have to say on this subject? Were the primitive ideas of God polytheistic, or monotheistic? According to the most dependable authorities and best scholars, the earliest religions of mankind were purely monotheistic, and disallowed many gods. Renouf supported this view of the religion of ancient Egypt and maintained there were very many eminent scholars who held the same view. That the primi-

tive religion of the Chinese was monotheistic is maintained by James Legge, who was professor of the Chinese language and literature in Oxford University. The very ancient Aryans, from whom sprang the Hindus, Persians, and most of the great European nations, held monotheism. Many eminent authorities in support of a primitive monotheism are cited by Dr. F. F. Ellinwood in his "Oriental Religions and Christianity" (pp. 222-265).

2. **Exclusively from Revelation.**—It is the opinion of some theologians that the mind is capable of a knowledge of God only by supernatural revelation. It has been reasoned in support of this view that such persons as Adam, Abraham, or Moses, to whom God gave such revelation, have had the clearest knowledge of God and that to the extent that men have been remote from these original revelations, either geographically or chronologically, they have held less correct ideas of God unless they have had the Scripture records of those revelations. This view has been made especially prominent by Watson and others who doubtless were caused to take this position out of reverence for the Word of God and especially in opposition to the false claims for the "natural religion" of English deism with which they came into conflict. Probably this very controversy which raged in their day influenced them unduly against the intuition of God's existence. Doubtless revelation is needed to enlarge and develop the innate idea of God, yet unless man already possessed the idea of God the revelation from God could have no authority for him, whether that revelation were transmitted by oral tradition or by the Scriptures.

3. **From a Process of Reasoning.**—Many of those who reject the idea of God as an intuition would refer the origin of the idea to a process of reasoning. Doubtless the mind is capable of learning about God by rational processes, but such a method of first obtaining the idea is rather a theoretical possibility than an actual fact. The mind does not wait for reasoning, or a logical process. When the proper conditions are brought about, the idea "flashes on the soul with the quickness and force of an immediate revelation." That reasoning is not the means of gaining the idea of God is evident from the fact that the strength of men's conviction of the being of God is not in proportion to their powers of reason. Multitudes of men who can not grasp the logical arguments of the divine existence yet have an un-

wavering conviction of its truth, while others of extraordinary reasoning power are skeptics.

What then is the place of reasoning as a means of knowing about God? First it must be allowed that rational arguments do much to enlarge and extend our intuitive idea of God. We can thus come to a clearer apprehension of his character and attributes. Again, these arguments for the divine existence have value in corroborating and confirming the intuitive conviction as being true, as by reasoning we may prove the veracity of the intuition that the whole is equal to the sum of all the parts. Yet the mind finds itself in possession of this knowledge immediately on the occurrence of the proper conditions, before it has time to reason.

III. What Does This Intuition Contain?

To know that any particular thing or person exists, one must necessarily know somewhat as to the nature, properties, qualities, characteristics, or attributes of that thing or person. Such knowledge is inseparable from the knowledge of the existence of the thing in the nature of the case. Therefore to know *that* God is, is necessarily to have some idea as to *what* God is, or concerning his attributes. The intuition that God exists contains also some idea of his nature. This does not mean that one can know God by intuition adequately for the performance of all human duties. The gross misconceptions that have mutilated men's thought of God are sufficient proof that at least in their present depraved condition men do not intuitively know the nature of God in important respects. How clear would be the contents of the intuition of God to one who has never known the moral perversion of depraved human nature can not be known. Yet when all this has been said, the fact remains that God's nature is known in a considerable measure. The intuition of God implies: (1) a personal being who may be properly worshiped; (2) a perfection of moral character in God that places men under moral obligation to him; (3) a power above on whom men are dependent. At least this much is contained in the intuition of God.

Chapter II

EVIDENCES OF GOD'S EXISTENCE

Although belief in God's existence is an intuition of the mind of man and arises spontaneously under proper conditions, yet theistic arguments have great value for corroboration and confirmation of that innate idea. Rational evidences should not be despised as being useless. The mind craves rational satisfaction, such as only logical argument can give, concerning this great truth. Also, the intuition alone is not in a position to meet the subtle attacks of skepticism. False reasoning must be met with rational argument. Again, formal argumentation is helpful in developing the intuitive idea of God, in explaining it and in illustrating it. Though the mind instinctively believes before philosophy has begun to set its proofs in order, yet the mind naturally seeks to supply to itself a logical account of its belief. However conclusive the proofs of theism may be, it is always to be remembered that the knowledge of God is not dependent upon them. The arguments are not held to demonstrate the fact of God, but they do show a degree of probability of the divine existence that amounts to certainty. Also, each argument need not be regarded as proving the whole doctrine of theism. One argument may prove one fact about God, and others other facts; so the various arguments constitute a series of proofs that is cumulative in nature.

The most common arguments for theism are four in number: (1) the First-cause, or Cosmological; (2) the Design, or Teleological; (3) the Human-nature, or Anthropological; (4) the A Priori, or Ontological. To these is sometimes added a fifth —the Biblical, or Revelation, Argument.

I. The First-Cause, or Cosmological, Argument

This argument for the Divine existence is based upon the fact of causation. Regarding the universe in its present form as an effect, it reasons that it must have had a sufficient cause. Because something can not come from nothing, and something now exists, therefore something has always existed. It further reasons that the original cause which is responsible for the beginning of the universe as we now know it must have been an eternal cause, and also a free cause that could volitionate at a

particular time the beginning of matter or the beginning of those changes in what most antitheists unscripturally regard as already existing matter that have resulted in the present universe. This free cause can be no less than an eternal person indefinitely great, whom we know as God.

The argument may be put more exactly in syllogistic form, as follows:

Major Premise.—Everything begun, whether substance or change in things before existing, must have had a sufficient preexisting cause.

Minor Premise.—The world in every part is continually changing.

Conclusion.—Therefore the world must have a cause outside of itself and the original cause must be eternal, uncaused, and possessing free will.

Two truths are requisite to the cosmological argument: (1) the principle of causation; (2) the universe is an effect of a cause outside itself. If these are shown to be true, the argument is sound proof of God's existence.

1. **The Law of Causation.**—Causation is self-evident and is universally recognized. It is a truth so thoroughly ineradicable, so universal, and so necessary that it must be regarded as is the idea of God itself, as being an intuition of the reason. That every event must have a cause is the belief of all men. And cause, to be a cause, must be cause sufficient or adequate to the result accomplished. If it is not such, it is not a cause.

Only in philosophical speculation do men ever think of denying the principle of causation. Such men as Hume and Mill have had the boldness to deny it theoretically, but they themselves in reasoning about the origin of the world and of the things it contains do not fail to employ the truth of causation. They have maintained that the idea of cause is the result of associating in our minds one thing with another and by the observation of invariable sequence wrongly assuming the first thing to be the cause of the second. But common sense tells us there is more in the relation of what we call cause and effect than mere regular succession. There is no more regular succession than day and night, yet who would suppose night is caused by day and day is caused by night? Or who would say

that summer and winter cause each other merely because of their invariably following each other?

But cause is more than the mere antecedent of an event. It is an antecedent to whose efficiency an event as an effect is due. The only cause of which we are immediately conscious is our own wills. We take a book from a shelf and lay it on the table. We know the location of the book on the table is the result of a cause and that personal will is that cause. We know the book would never have passed from the shelf to the table except for a cause. Likewise we may properly regard every event as being the result of a cause even though we are not that cause. It is true there may be dependent causes that are themselves the results of other causes, but reason requires an original and eternal cause of all these dependent causes that is independent and free.

But the objector to the First-cause Argument professes to find an alternative in the idea of an infinite regressive series of dependent causes. But such an infinite series of causes and effects is unreasonable, because a mere series of changes must itself have had a cause. The infinite-series idea is like "the chain that hangs on nothing." To follow back through any number of dependent causes as links in a chain is not to find the first and real cause. The mind can not be content to rest in such an endless-series idea, but instinctively leaps to the thought of an independent first cause. But further disproof of the infinite-series idea is needless. No one believes it. It is used in antitheistic reasoning only as an objection to sound theistic argument, and then is cast away by those who use it.

Again, it is objected to the idea of a necessary independent first cause that the world may be regarded as being many interacting parts as dependent causes. It is as if the points of four pencils were placed upon the table and the tops leaned against each other in the form of a pyramid so that they are mutually self-supporting. We readily admit that the universe is constituted with these interacting dependent causes. It is a fact of science and is open to the observation of all men. Sandstone is formed from beds of sand, and beds of sand are the result of the crumbling of the stone again. The blood is kept pure by the respiration of the lungs, and yet the lungs can not continue to function except by a supply of pure blood. But allowing all this, these interacting dependent causes need a cause for their

being and interaction. As Bowne has well said, "An interacting many can not exist without a coordinating one." No number of dependent causes can constitute an independent cause when added together, as independence can not originate in dependence. Back of all these interacting dependent causes, then, must be an independent cause that coordinates them and causes their interaction, as in the aforementioned pyramid of pencils that support each other, an independent external cause must arrange the pencils so they will support each other. Reason requires, not only for the series of causes, but also for the interacting system of causes, a real and independent cause of that series or system.

Any real cause, then, must be an original cause, not merely an intermediate link in a chain of dependent causes and effects. The mind will be content with nothing less than that cause which supports the most distant dependent cause. And reason requires that the original cause be eternal in duration. Nothing can not be a cause. Something exists now and it could not have come out of antecedent nothingness; so somewhat must have always existed that caused all things as they now are.

Again, any real cause must be a free cause. "An uncaused cause is a free cause."—G. P. Fisher, Natural Theology, p. 14. If it acts of necessity it is dependent, and must itself be only an effect and a result of another cause. Only an independent cause can be a free cause; and independent, free cause certainly implies free will in a conscious independent being. Man has the power of first cause of certain effects because of his free will. Both from intuition and from rational processes it is certain that real original cause is to be attributed only to a personal will; therefore to whatever extent it can be shown that the world is the result of a cause exterior to itself we have proof of a personal God as creator.

2. **The Universe Is an Effect.**—As it now exists, the universe is an effect. Nothing is more strongly stressed by modern science than that both organic and inorganic nature are the result of a process and came to be what they are through a process. Man is evidently of comparatively recent origin, according to science. Before man, the lower forms of life had a beginning, and beyond them was a period when no life existed—an azoic state. Even the nebular and evolutionary hypotheses hold that all

things which now exist had a beginning and have been evolved from a primordial fire-mist. But this beginning must have had a cause; for a beginning is an event, and every event must have a cause. A spontaneous generation of the primitive life is not admissible with science, and is practically a denial of the principle of causation, as will be shown later. Also, that alleged primordial fire-mist can not have been the eternal and original cause of all; for if it were eternal it would have been mature, or fully developed. And if so, it could not have further developed into a universe. Also if it were eternal it would necessarily be immutable and could not change. But if it changed, that is proof it is not eternal, but is like all other changing forms of matter—a result of a cause. The minute physical divisions of matter, the molecules, being of exact equality, bear the marks of being manufactured articles and not eternal or self-existent, according to Sir John Herschell.

3. **What the Argument Proves.**—With the proof, then, of the principle of causation and that the universe is an effect of which no sufficient cause is to be found in itself, reason requires an adequate extra-mundane cause, eternal and uncaused, possessing free will and omnipotent power. These necessary qualities point strongly to the personality of the first cause. The Cosmological Argument, then, furnishes proof of theism with a degree of certainty little short of a demonstration, by proving the fact of a first cause, that that cause is eternal, uncaused, unchangeable, omnipotent, free, and, we may safely say in harmony with many able thinkers, a personal Cause who is God.

II. The Design, or Teleological, Argument

1. **Nature of the Argument.**—The Design, or Teleological, Argument reasons from marks of design, or from orderly and useful arrangements, in nature to an intelligent cause. It is not, however, a reasoning from design to a designer, as it is sometimes wrongly stated; for design implies a designer; but rather a reasoning from *marks* of design to a designer.

By design is meant the selection and pursuit of ends. It is the choosing of an end to be attained, the selection of proper means to accomplish it, and the use of the means to attain the end chosen. When we see at the foot of a rocky cliff broken fragments of rock of unequal sizes, irregular and uneven shapes,

strewn about regardless of their relation to each other, we decide at once the size, shape, and location of them is a result of chance. But when we see hundreds of bricks of equal size, even color, and faces all bearing one imprint, laid in straight, level rows in hard mortar and forming a perpendicular wall with suitable openings for windows and doors, we decide the qualities and arrangement of them are the result of intelligent purpose or design. It is not necessary that one shall have seen the bricks manufactured and laid in the wall to know the wall is the result of design. The very fact of orderly and useful arrangement therein is abundant proof of contrivance by an intelligent being.

The Design Argument may be given in syllogistic form, as follows:

Major Premise.—Orderly and harmonious cooperation of many separate parts can be accounted for only by the assumption of an intelligent cause.

Minor Premise.—The world everywhere exhibits orderly and harmonious cooperation of all its parts.

Conclusion.—Therefore the original and absolute cause of the world is an intelligent cause.

As in the works of man we reason from marks of design to an intelligent designer, so we may as properly reason from evidences of contrivance, or evidences of adaptation of means to ends, in nature, that the author of nature is intelligent. Nor is it necessary that we shall have known by observation and experience that an intelligent agent is behind nature. It is enough that we know from experience what are the characteristic signs of intelligence. Then when we see those signs whether in the contrivances of man or in nature we properly decide they are the result of an intelligent mind. The very nature of design is such that it implies intelligence, and wherever marks of contrivance are found it is certain they must be referred to intelligence. Not only in the origin of nature as shown in the First-cause Argument must we recognize the principle of causation, but also in the orderly arrangement of nature as set forth in the Design Argument.

Orderly and useful arrangement in nature is certain. Marks of design are apparent everywhere and are conclusive proof that the author of nature is an intelligent person. All science assumes that nature is rationally constructed. Huxley said, "Sci-

ence is the discovery of a rational order that pervades the universe.'' Except for that uniformity which shows nature to be a system and a result of design science would be impossible. The results of chance can not be understood by the mind. *But the universe can be understood by the mind, showing clearly that it is the result of a mind.* It may be objected that the orderly arrangements in nature are not *designed* to be useful but are merely used because they can be used. But he who says the eye sees merely because it can see, the ear hears merely because it can hear, the hand handles only because capable of doing so and that none of them were designated to perform such functions says what the common sense of men everywhere refuses to accept. As well might it be said that the locomotive draws its train merely because it can draw it, not because built to do so; or that the printing-press prints books because it can do so, not because it was designed to do so. How much more reasonable it is to believe that useful arrangements in nature as well as in human devices are the result of the selection and pursuit of ends, or that the beneficial functioning of nature is as it is because a kind and gracious Father designed it so for the sake of his children.

What being, says Cicero, that is ''destitute of intellect and reason could have produced these things which not only had need of reason to cause them to be, but *which are such as can be understood only by the highest exertions of reason?''* (*De Nat. Deorum*, II, 44).

Probably the Design Argument can not be better illustrated than it has been by William Paley (Natural Theology, p. 5). His argument in substance is as follows: If in crossing a field I strike my foot against a stone and ask how it came there, I might reply that it has been there forever. But if later in my walk I find a watch and the question of the origin of the watch be raised, the answer must be very different. A casual observance of its mechanism—of its wheels with cogs exactly fitting into each other, of its springs, of the relation of part to part, and of its exact adjustment so that it exactly measures time—furnishes convincing proof that it is a reliable example of human contrivance, and not the result of chance. And even the discovery in the watch of useless, broken, or deranged parts would not invalidate the reasoning that it was designed by an

intelligent mind. For more than a century Dr. Paley's argument has stood unanswered, and it may properly be regarded as unanswerable. Advancement in science has made minor adjustments necessary, and to the extent the evolutionary hypothesis has been given place an extra link must be allowed in the argument, yet it still stands in all its strength.

To carry Paley's watch illustration a step farther, suppose that watch I find in the field has not only a fine mechanism for the measurement of time, but also contains within itself an elaborate machine-shop with lathes and other necessary machinery and has the ability to manufacture other watches like itself, and not only as good, but better watches than itself, and that it had itself been evolved from a less perfect watch. Would such remarkable ability in that hypothetical watch disprove a designing intelligence behind that race of watches? If watches came from other watches, they would not be so immediately the result of intelligent design, but certainly the cause that originated them and involved in that first watch those wonderful qualities later evolved must have been indeed an intelligence far superior to that manifested in actual watches as they have been designed by men. Then if evolution were admitted as a process in nature, instead of invalidating the idea of design and the design argument for God's existence, it would strengthen it. Whether the theory of evolution be regarded as true or false, we may consistently cite marks of design in proof of an intelligent creator, though in the one case design would be less directly manifested than in the other, yet just as really shown.

The Design Argument is probably the simplest and most convincing of all theistic proofs. It has been appealed to by theists of all times, nations, and religions. It is frequently referred to in the Scriptures. "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork" (Psa. 19:1). In Rom. 1:20 the apostle Paul affirms that God's eternal power may be clearly seen in the things that are made. Heathen philosophers, including Anaxagoras, Socrates, and Cicero, made much use of it. So did also the Jewish writer Philo. All the church fathers and theologians until the present day have appealed to it in proof of theism. Truly God "hath not left himself without witness" among all men.

2. **Evidences of Design in Nature.**—The marks of intelligent

contrivance in nature are countless. They may be found on every hand. They may be seen in the movements of the vast planets far away in the starry sky and also in every minute insect on the earth. In all the realm of inorganic nature they are to be found, as well as in every plant that grows. And again, they may be found in large numbers in each of the millions of bodies of both animals and men. They appear, not only in single organs, but in the relation of organs to each other. Evidences of design are also apparent in the adaptations of the world to the life of plants and animals, and of the organs of animals to their instincts. Limited space excludes an extended exhibition of examples of design in nature, but those here given will serve at least as an indication of the nature of the evidence.

The remarkable operation of an intricate machine often fills a thoughtful person with wonder, and he is impressed with the far-seeing design and intelligence of its inventor. But how much more wonderful is the human body, and how much more does it show design! What machine is so perfect in its mechanism and operation as is this one? All its parts, organs, and functions are nicely adjusted to each other. It repairs its defective parts while in operation, and generates its own energy. But it is through definite concrete examples that the most vivid impression of design in nature is received.

If the intricate lens of a camera manifests design, how much more does the eye? Their general principles are similar; but how much more perfect is the eye than the lens of a camera! It is not an opening in the head, nor a mere nerve center such as one might suppose from what some evolutionists say in attempting an evolutionary theory of its origin. It has a lid as a means of protecting the tender ball, and that lid moves with wonderful quickness. The ball is not set immovable in its socket, but has muscles so attached to it that it can be turned in all directions of the field of vision. Again, the structure of the eyeball is wonderfully adapted to the light, and to the function of seeing. The opening to the lens is contracted or enlarged, in adjustment to the amount of light falling upon the retina, by a most delicate arrangement of muscles that are not dependent upon the will, but on the stimulus of the light itself. The lens itself is capable of such exact adjustment that the rays of light are refracted in such a manner as to bring them to a proper

focus on the retina. Spread out on this retina is the only nerve in the body susceptible of light and color. These are but a few of the evidences of design in the structure of the eye. As certainly as design may be seen in any human contrivance, it may be seen in this wonderful organ. But what unthinking credulity must that be which would rather attribute the intricate wonders of the eye to chance, or another non-intelligent cause! And if it be objected that the eye, with all its wonders, may be the result of evolution, it is not necessary to argue the point, but only to say in reply: Then how far-seeing and intelligent must have been the designer to implant the power to effect by a process of evolution that wonderful organ as we now know it.

Likewise the ear is not a mere opening into the head, but a very delicate and complicated device for catching sound-waves and producing the sensation of hearing by means of the auditory nerve. It is a far more wonderful mechanism than that exhibited in a telephone or radiophone receiving instrument; and as they bear undeniable evidence of design by man, so does this much more of a designing creator. If space would allow, proofs of design might be shown in various other organs, as of digestion, reproduction, the heart, the lungs, the nerves, and in the bones, muscles, and skin, which are all wonderfully adapted to their use. But these have been exhaustively discussed by many able writers, to whom those are referred who would pursue this phase of the subject farther (see Natural Theology [Paley]. Bridgewater Treatises. Natural Theology [Fisher]).

Not only in single organs is design shown, but also in the relation of organs to each other and to the conditions under which the animal is to live. The fish, suited to live in the water, as shown by his gills, has also fins and tail adapted to swimming, as is also the shape of its body. The bird with wings suitable for flying in the air has also hollow bones and feathers, which make flight possible. The bird with long legs for wading in the water has also a long neck. And the bird that floats on the water has feathers impenetrable by water, and web-feet. Even man, with a mind superior to all other animals and capable of wonderful contriving, has also an upright body and a hand capable of executing all the mind contrives. Man's hand is far better adapted to work than is the hand of any species of ape. In fact, the human hand is so remarkable in its mechanism that

Dr. Charles Bell has written an entire volume about it as an example of design. What wise design is shown by this relation of organs! And fully as remarkable is that design shown in adapting organs to instincts of particular species. Carnivorous animals have claws and teeth suited to catching and eating their prey, while those with an instinct for eating vegetables have teeth and stomachs adapted to their instinct.

A still more remarkable example of design is the provision for the support of the young even before they are born. With mammals, the breasts or udder of the mother begin to swell and store a supply of milk; so as soon as the young are born, the most nourishing food possible is ready for them. Similarly, a food-supply is also stored in the egg. Certainly here is proof of a wise, foreseeing mind that designed these things so.

Even in inorganic nature are to be seen marks of a similar wise design. Except for the fact of evaporation of moisture in the atmosphere by heat, and its condensation by cold, life would be impossible on the earth. On warm summer days life would be destroyed by the intense heat except for the fact that heat is taken up by the moisture of the earth, vegetation, or bodies of water as the water becomes vapor. Likewise, on the cool summer nights vegetation would die of frost and cold, and life would consequently soon become extinct on the earth, except for the condensation of the vapor in the atmosphere into the dew; as it thus condenses, a vast amount of heat stored during the day is given out and the temperature is kept moderate. What a wonderful provision is this! It is either a proof of design by a kind creator, or else a result of chance. The atheist may be credulous enough to believe the latter, but the common sense of mankind has always felt constrained to attribute it to the design of a heavenly Father.

It is a general law of nature that bodies contract as they cool. Water becomes heavier as it cools and the cold water settles to the bottom, while the warmer remains at the top. But by a special law of nature that is very singular, ice does not first form at the bottom of a body of water, but when the temperature of that water at the bottom falls to about four degrees above the freezing-point it begins to expand and becomes lighter; so ice always forms on top first. Except for this special law the larger bodies of water in the temperate zone would soon

become solid masses of ice, frozen from the bottom to the top, that would not melt during the entire summer, and all life in them would perish. If this special provision in nature does not show design in nature, then what could show it? Even the theory of evolution can not account for such a provision; but it must be regarded as a direct result of design.

The power of gravitation is so common, we are apt to overlook it. But suppose the attraction of gravitation were but one fourth as strong as it is; how difficult it would be to keep our houses on their foundations, and what a task it would be to keep on one's feet on windy days! Or imagine the drawing of gravitation four times as strong as it is now; how tired one would become of his own weight, and especially of carrying necessary burdens! If heavy persons should sit or lie down, they would be unable ever to rise up again. Or suppose the axis of our earth were perpendicular to our sun instead of inclined; then no changing seasons would ever be known, but only one long, monotonous, changeless temperature. Surely a kind creator has wisely designed all these things.

3. **Objections to the Design Argument.**—It is sometimes objected to the foregoing reasoning that nature does not always appear to bear evidences of design, and useless and rudimentary organs in animals are pointed out as examples. Nor can the existence of such be properly denied. The spleen is sometimes cited as an example of a useless organ. But it may only properly be said that its use is not known to be important. Physiologists are seeking to learn more about its function and purpose. The mere fact that animals may live when it is removed proves only that it is not necessary to life, not that it has no purpose. Knowledge of the important functions of the large majority of the organs of the body gives such evidence of design in creation that present ignorance of the use of a few organs can not invalidate it. Also those rudimentary organs such as the teeth of whales, which they never need, and mammæ in males of the higher species are cited as not supporting the Design Argument. In answer it may be said, first, that such are only in organic nature, and there are very few in number. Also it is a low view of utility that considers only the immediate wants of organisms. In a vehicle or a building, some parts serve a good purpose in giving beauty, symmetry, and unity. Doubtless some of these

rudimentary organs are best understood as serving this purpose. They are merely the characteristic features of the type, even though the individual does not need them.

Again, it is objected to the Design Argument that all may have come as a result of chance. Inasmuch as they are few who thus deify chance, our answer may be brief. This objection will not be held by one who stops to think. It is affirmed that the world might have come to be by chance just as the Iliad might have been produced by throwing down quantities of letters. But every one knows that so large a number of separate elements would not accidentally fall into orderly relationship though trials should be made throughout eternity. Long ago Cicero denied the validity of that objection, and referred to that same illustration of thus making a book. Nor is the objection of "efficient cause" much better. It affirms the eye is the cause of sight, and that it sees because it can see, not because it was designed to see. It may properly be allowed that the eye sees because it can see, but also that it sees because it was made to see. This objection asks us to close our eyes to the marks of design and not think. It is but little better, if any, than the objection of chance, to which it is closely akin.

Another objection to the Design Argument consists in an appeal to the theory of evolution as giving a sufficient account of the present orderly constitution of nature. It is assumed that law, if given sufficient time, can accomplish all that has been accomplished. It overlooks the very important fact that law is not an agent, but only a method by which an agent works; so can do nothing except as it is employed by an agent. Only beings are agents and unless a being were behind any supposed law of evolution, that law could have no efficiency. Whatever might be evolved by such a law must first have been involved by the agent employing the method. Even Darwin, though he at first expressed the belief that natural selection excludes design, was inclined in later life to predicate designed laws which determine things generally. Then all the intelligent purpose shown in nature now must have controlled the evolution of it from the beginning, if evolution is assumed. Therefore evolution could at the most be no more than a method of an intelligent designer.

Objectors to the Design Argument also sometimes assume

an overstrained modesty in theological questions and assert that because of finite intelligence we are not capable of knowing that the world is a result of design, and that all we can know is that things appear to be designed by an intelligent mind for certain ends. But do we not commonly assume that things are as they appear to be? Physical science bases its inductions on the appearance of things. Why may not theology do likewise? And if we can not fully comprehend the infinite, does it therefore follow that we can know nothing of God's operation and design in nature? Because we can not comprehend the vastness of limitless space, shall we cease to recognize what we can comprehend of it?

The last objection to which attention is called is that based upon the operation of instinct. It is said that as blind instinct operating through animals may accomplish results similar to those of intelligent purpose, so all that appears to be design may be the result of such a cause. In reply, let it be first stated that instinct may not be a blind impulse, but, as Paley has defined it, "a propensity prior to experience and independent of instruction." Certainly it is found only in organisms, and should be regarded as belonging to the animal constitution. It evidently indicates great intelligence in the power that implanted instinct in animals. But there is no reason for attributing instinct to blind force. Instinct itself is a remarkable example of design, and can be adequately accounted for only by regarding it as an instrument of an intelligent mind.

In spite of all objections, the Design Argument for God's existence still stands in all its strength. Far-seeing design in the author of the universe is evident from both inorganic and organic creation. Marks of wise contrivance are seen everywhere, far surpassing any human ingenuity. The denial of design in creation consistently requires denial of all intelligent contrivance in men. The argument is clearly corroborative of the correctness of our intuition of the existence of a personal God.

III. The Human Nature, or Anthropological, Argument

1. **The Argument Described.**—The Human Nature, or Anthropological Argument is frequently called the Moral Argument, and sometimes the Psychological Argument; but we prefer designating it by the more comprehensive term Anthropological because it reasons from the higher part of human nature generally. It

reasons from man's mental, moral, and religious nature that the creator must have possessed a similar nature. In reasoning from effect to an adequate first cause it is like the Cosmological Argument, of which it is a particular example. As the material universe must have had a sufficient cause, so must also the soul of man. The purpose in setting forth this as a separate argument is that it shows the author of man's soul to be the possessor of a like nature. The lofty powers of the human spirit could never have come from non-intelligent matter and force, but must be assigned to a cause possessing qualities of a far higher grade. This argument also partakes of the nature of that from design —in showing the adaptations of human nature to nature as a whole.

It may be stated in part in the form of a syllogism, as follows:

Major Premise.—As an intelligent and free moral being, man has had a beginning upon earth.

Minor Premise.—Non-intelligent matter and force are not an adequate cause of intelligence, free will, and conscience in man.

Conclusion.—Therefore, as an effect, man's spiritual nature can be referred only to a cause possessing intelligence, freedom, and a moral nature, which imply personality.

2. **Argument from Man's Intelligence.**—Man's intellect must have had an adequate cause. But it can not properly be attributed to the non-intelligent. As well might we expect fulness to emanate from emptiness. Mind can not have come from matter. That they are essentially different in nature is the general conviction of mankind. Only in speculative theories is the distinction ever denied. In the common consciousness of men as shown by their forms of speech about mind and matter or in referring to conscious existence after death, the distinction is clear. No two ideas are more widely different than those of mind and matter. Matter is known by its properties, but mind only by its phenomena. Also the terms describing each are essentially different. Thought is not conceived of as having length, weight, area, color, thickness, or temperature. Only in figurative usage can any such terms be applied to mind and its phenomena. Inasmuch as an effect can not contain nor be greater than its cause, intelligence can not have come from the non-intelligent. Nothing can come out of matter not originally in it. In attempting to show mind came from matter, Tyndall recognized this

difficulty by calling for a new definition of matter. But no definition of mind and matter nor calling mind the "inner face" of matter can change the facts or bridge the gulf that has ever differentiated mind and matter in fact and in the thought of mankind. The cause of the mind of man is an eternal mind; and because man's mind is, we know God has mind.

3. **Argument from Man's Freedom.**—Another fact concerning the nature of God that may be known from the nature of man is that God is a free being. Man's free will proves he originated from a source possessing free will. It is no more possible that man with his free will could have originated in that which is not free than that fulness should have come out of emptiness. The God of the pantheist could never have produced man. That man has free will is the universal belief of mankind, and is denied only in speculative reasoning. Man possesses a firm conviction of his freedom, from which he can not alienate himself. Even if he does deny it, he constantly shows by his words and actions that he can not cease to believe it. But his freedom is not like the water of a river flowing between its banks, which of necessity must flow toward the lower point and is free to do only that. For man has the power of alternative choice. He can change the course of a river and, as he chooses, cause it to flow in any one of several directions. He can build houses, bend iron, or freely act on a body contrary to the power of gravitation. But more will be said about man's freedom in the appropriate place. The fact of his freedom is evidence that his maker is free.

4. **Argument from Man's Moral Nature.**—Our conscience, or feeling of moral obligation, implies One over us to whose law we are responsible. By the very constitution of our nature we have a sense of right and wrong. It is often expressed by the words *ought* and *ought not*. It is due to our recognition of one superior to us on whom we are dependent, and who rightfully has authority over us. It has reference to law that we are under and which we recognize as right. Conscience is real, and its requirements are imperative. It can not be denied nor ignored without its reproof. It is not controlled by the will. We can not free ourselves from its requirements. It demands and rewards obedience, and punishes disobedience. But all this points to a law over us, and that law implies a giver and administrator

of it who is over us and not appointed by us. It is also clear that the one above us is a free personal being. It is probably this sense of moral obligation to God especially which has been the ground of the universal conviction of men that God is. If there were no personal God, then this would be a lie stamped indelibly upon human nature. This can not be. There must be a personal creator possessed of a moral nature including attributes of justice and righteousness that are reflected in similar qualities in the nature of man as a moral being, for certainly the moral can not come from the non-moral.

5. **Argument from Man's Religious Nature.**—Again, man's religious nature or tendency to worship implies God. Man is incurably religious, and has always and everywhere worshiped. This tendency to worship finds its complement only in a being who, as a person, is capable of communion, and as being perfect is worthy of adoration. Among all plants and animals, and in regard to the physical nature of man there is found no desire, capacity, or necessity but what nature has made adequate provisions to satisfy. Plants require water, and water exists for their satisfaction. Animals and men have an appetite for food, and appropriate food is provided to satisfy. Such a law and means of satisfaction of desire is a general law of nature. Shall we not, then, also suppose there is a complement to the craving of men's souls? The animal nature is fully satisfied by the material things of this world. But the soul has aspirations for things beyond this world. It seeks for fellowship with a higher realm, spiritual and eternal. It has a capacity and desire for loving, trusting, and worshiping a higher being on whom it feels dependent and whom it would fellowship. As thirst of the body of man points to the fact of the existence of water, so certainly does the thirst of the soul prove the existence of God; for one of these desires is as natural and as universal as the other. And when millions of Christians testify that they have found a satisfaction for the soul's desires in a blessed fellowship and communion with God, who can consistently deny it?

6. **Objections to the Human-nature Argument.**—Various objections are made to this argument; but principally it has been charged with being anthropomorphic, or of ascribing human qualities to God. The objection is well represented by Herbert Spencer as follows: "If we make the grotesque supposition that

the ticking and other movements of a watch constitute a kind of consciousness, and that a watch possessed of such a consciousness insisted on regarding the watchmaker's action as determined, like its own, by springs and escapements, we should simply complete a parallel of which religious teachers think much. And were we to suppose that a watch not only formulated the cause of its existence in these mechanical terms, but held that watches were bound out of reverence so to formulate this cause, and even vituperated as atheistic watches any that did not venture so to formulate, we should merely illustrate the presumption of theologians by carrying their own argument a step further'' (First Principles of a New Philosophy, pp. 94, 95). The objection is so well answered by Samuel Harris that his reply is here given, and is deemed a sufficient answer: ''The objection rests on the absurdity that, if a watch should become endowed with reason, it would still remain a mere machine, just as it was before, and therefore would see nothing in itself but mechanism, and could ascribe nothing but mechanism to its maker. But if a watch were endowed with reason it would no longer be a mere machine, but a rational person. Then contemplating its own mechanism it would infer, precisely as a rational man does in contemplating it, that it had a maker like itself in intelligence, but not necessarily like itself in mechanism. And should this intelligent watch ridicule all intelligent watches that believe they were made by an intelligent maker, it would be like Mr. Spencer ridiculing intelligent men for believing their Creator to be an intelligent being'' (The Self-revelation of God, pp. 434, 435).

IV. The Ontological Argument

1. **Statement of the Argument.**—The Ontological Argument is known as an a priori argument, and is usually made to include all argument for the divine existence that does not reason from effect to cause, as do those we have heretofore considered. It endeavors to show that the real objective existence of God is involved in the idea of such a being. Much stress has been placed upon it by theistic writers of past centuries, and it is principally for this reason it is stated here, rather than because it is commonly regarded now as having value. It has been employed in varying forms by many eminent men, including Anselm (to

whom the original form of it is attributed), Descartes, Samuel Clarke, Kant, and Cousin. As it is representative of the others, Anselm's argument is given following, as stated by Dr. Miley: "We have the idea of the most perfect being, a being than whom a greater or more perfect can not be conceived. This idea includes, and must include, actual existence, because actual existence is of the necessary content of the idea of the most perfect. An ideal being, however perfect in conception, can not answer to the idea of the most perfect. Hence we must admit the actual existence; for only with this content can we have the idea of the most perfect being. This most perfect being is God. Therefore God must exist." Or the argument may be stated briefly as follows: Because there exists the idea of the most perfect being possible, consequently such a being actually and necessarily exists.

2. **Theistic Value of the Argument.**—The argument is open to criticism on the ground that the existence of the idea of a thing does not prove the existence of that thing. Certainly the argument is not true of all the fantastic forms of which superstitious people have had an idea. But it is answered that the idea of God is an exception because necessary being must be admitted. Whatever theistic value the argument has, it has not been apparent to many capable thinkers, especially of the present. Whether or not its defect can be clearly stated, it certainly is not valuable as a proof, and we agree with the large proportion of modern theistic writers that it is inconclusive as a proof of theism.

Chapter III

ANTITHEISTIC THEORIES

Antitheism includes all theories that deny the doctrine of a personal God, who is creator, preserver, and ruler of all things. It includes atheism, polytheism, pantheism, materialism, and materialistic evolution. Materialism might be made to include positivism and also naturalistic evolution; but the classification here made, by which positivism is included under materialism and evolution is treated separately, is thought to be the most practical for the majority of readers. In the theistic proofs already given, we have sufficient disproof of all these theories; therefore the purpose here will be principally to show the elements in them opposed to theism.

I. Atheism

1. **Sense of Atheism.**—Atheism is the open and positive denial that God exists. It is a pure negation and affirms nothing. It is a denial of what theism affirms. Few persons openly profess to be atheists because the term itself is one of reproach. Those who deny the existence of a personal God usually profess belief in an impersonal something as being God. Such persons assign to the place of God, thought, force, motion, the "unknowable," the "infinite absolute," or moral order. Herbert Spencer in his "New Philosophy" deifies force, and regards it as unknowable. But such persons in their endeavor to save themselves from the disgrace and odium of atheism do violence to the correct meaning of the terms "God" and "atheism." God does not mean mere force, and he who allows no other God is an atheist, whether he admits it or not. But we will here use Atheism in the more restricted sense, and discuss these other antitheistic theories separately.

2. **Unreasonableness of Atheism.**—Atheism is a most unreasonable profession. As much as any man can consistently say is, "I do not know there is a God," and this is only antitheistic agnosticism. What arrogant presumption on the part of him who says "there is no God"! How can any one not infinite in his capacities know there is no God? Unless one is omnipresent —in every place in the universe at the present moment—how can he know but that God is somewhere? If he does not fully

know every personal being in the universe, how can he know but that one with whom he is unacquainted is God? He arrogates to himself the infinite qualities of God in his denial of God. But if he is not infinite in his knowledge of all places, times, and causes, how can he say God is not somewhere, that he has not been known to act in past ages, or that he has not caused certain things? Surely, "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God!"

3. **Possibility of Atheism.**—To have doubts about the being of God is possible, and certainly many persons have doubted. But it is quite another thing to believe there is no God. To believe stedfastly the latter, without doubting, is impossible. So to believe would be to free oneself from the moral law, which can not be done, to reject the cause of all things, and practically deny all existence, as all existence may as reasonably be denied as that of God. By speculation or otherwise, one may arrive at the place where he will temporarily cease to be conscious of his belief in God. But with the removal of that speculative influence he will naturally revert to conscious belief in God.

II. Polytheism

1. **Meaning and Origin of Polytheism.**—Polytheism is from two Greek words meaning many gods. According to this theory the attributes and activities of the infinite God are distributed among many limited gods. The testimony of both the Bible and history is that the original religion of mankind was monotheistic, but that at an early date men apostatized from the worship of the one true God and began to worship many deities. From that time throughout human history polytheism has been widely prevalent, and is even at the present. The worship of a plurality of gods began in nature worship. Men began to "serve the creature more than the creator." They began to worship the various powers of nature with which they came in contact and by which they were benefited, especially the sun, moon, stars, as well as fire, water, and the air. Then these powers were personified, and later it was assumed that a personal god ruled over each. Especially did the common people come to believe in the actual existence of these imaginary deities. But the more enlightened have usually held either monotheism or pantheism.

2. **Different Aspects of Polytheism.**—The character of polytheism has varied according to the traditions, culture, and other influences prevalent among the people practising it. Among degraded savages it has degenerated to fetish-worship; with the cultured Greeks of the past it was made to express their refined humanitarianism by deifying their heroic men; while in India, where it originated in pantheistic philosophy, it has been carried to great extremes both for number of deities and also for the degraded character of many of them. The apostle Paul states that in their heathen worship the Gentiles sacrificed to demons and not to God (1 Cor. 10:20). It is not inconsistent with the known facts of idol-worship, nor with the common usage of the term for demons, to say that evil spirits have taken advantage of this apostate worship of polytheism and by supernatural manifestations in relation to it have led its devotees to worship them. This accounts for the alleged supernatural element in polytheistic religions and in a measure for men's faith in them. Probably the error of polytheism is sufficiently shown by the unity displayed in nature, the evil fruits of polytheism, and the positive proofs of theism.

III. Pantheism

1. **Definition of Pantheism.**—Pantheism etymologically means all is God, or that God is all. But probably it would be unfair to the many notable philosophers holding it, to define the theory of pantheism in the very literal sense that the pen with which these words are written is a part of God or that the book the reader holds in his hand is a part of God, yet the idea as represented by them seems to be this. Difficulty attends every attempt briefly to define pantheism, because it has been held so differently in different times and places. To describe its various aspects would be to give a history of it. The oldest pantheism is that of India, where it has been prevalent for thousands of years. It also had a great influence in forming the philosophies of Greece. Modern pantheism had its origin shortly after the Reformation, with Spinoza, one of its ablest advocates.

2. **Monistic Aspects of Pantheism.**—Pantheism is strongly monistic, affirming there is but one substance. That one substance is God. Materialistic pantheism asserts this one substance is matter. This is practically atheistic materialism. Idealistic pantheism makes that one substance to be mind. But the com-

mon sense of mankind rejects such an idea, and even the supporters of it do not find it possible to act in conformity with their theory. The common form of pantheism affirms of that one absolute substance that it has two modes of manifestation: (1) As thought it is mind. (2) As extension it is matter. Pantheism denies the personality of God, and allows that he comes to consciousness only in the thoughts of men or higher created orders such as angels. It also denies to God free will and affirms all acts are of God and necessary. Some professed pantheists inconsistently affirm free will; but in its nature pantheism is strongly fatalistic. Spinoza consistently held there is no real self-determination in the universe. Pantheism requires necessitated evolution of all things.

3. **Defects of Pantheism.**—Pantheism is to be rejected for various reasons. Its fundamental principle of monism, or of but a sole substance, is a purely unprovable assumption that is contradicted by the facts of nature. Again, it is objectionable because it denies that God has intelligence, freedom, and personality, and thus it fails to account for the first cause of the universe and its marks of design. Also, such an impersonal God offers no more than atheism from the religious viewpoint. It affords no divine fellowship, no divine person to receive love and worship. The God of pantheism can not draw out our reverence because we as persons are greater, and also he must be identified, not only with all the good in the world, but also with all the evil. It offers no kind heavenly Father to awaken in us devotion. It also fails to provide any ground for moral obligation. Not only in its essential nature, but also as illustrated by its history it is but one step removed from atheism.

IV. Materialism

1. **Antitheistic Character of Materialism.**—Materialism denies the distinction between matter and mind, affirming that all that exists is matter only, and that all phenomena are the actions of matter. It affirms that matter is eternal, possessing in itself the inherent power to develop all forms of life, including the power of thought. Not only does it deny the existence of the human spirit as a distinct immaterial entity, but it also necessarily denies the existence of a spiritual personal God. It is at present probably the most prevalent of all the antitheistic theo-

ries. It allies itself with science and assumes to be one of the "assured results of scientific investigation." The materialism of modern science is not new, but essentially the same as that of Epicurus of ancient times. It has maintained the same general antitheistic character throughout modern times whether as developed from Locke's philosophy, as represented by Hartley or Priestley, as held in England or France in the eighteenth century or as later represented in the "Positivism" of Comte.

2. **Fruitless Attempt to Account for Thought.**—No two objects for thought are so different as mind and matter. Matter we know by its properties, but mind only by its phenomena. The terms that describe the nature of one are inadequate to describe the other. Men have instinctively referred the qualities of matter to the substance called matter and the phenomena of mind to another and different substance called spirit. Thought and feeling are known only through consciousness, but material things through sensation. But materialism denies this fundamental distinction between mind and matter that has always been the universal belief of mankind.

Materialism denies that intelligence is the cause of order in the world and affirms, on the other hand, that such order is the cause of intelligence. With its denial of mind it attempts to account for thought as being the result of jarring atoms in the brain. It makes all thought to be the result of sensations. According to one theory the nerves are started vibrating by a particular affection, and this vibration continues along the nerve until it reaches the brain. Here it produces a vibratory movement upon the atoms of the brain, which constitutes sensation. By the frequent repetition of such sensations the vibratory movement acquires the power of repeating itself spontaneously —and behold, thought is the result! But this theory of thought is confronted with great difficulties, not the least of which is a lack of a unitary agent as a ground for memory. The transitory and constantly changing atoms composing the brain fail to provide such a unitary agent. Such a theory of thought is to be regarded as superficial and unprovable.

3. **Reasoning from Analogy Defective.**—By its denial of mind as distinct essence, and consequently by disallowing the existence of an infinite personal Spirit as creator of all things, materialism is confronted by the necessity of otherwise accounting for

the existence of the principle of life in living matter. An attempt is made to account for it by certain analogies. Materialists tell us that as water is composed of oxygen and hydrogen and yet the properties of water are not to be found in these elements, so likewise living matter is composed of carbonic acid, water, and ammonia though the properties of living matter are not to be found in those elements. And it is reasoned that as nothing is necessary but the combination of its constituent elements to form water, so no life principle is necessary to be added to the combined elements composing living matter to constitute them such. But their attempt at reasoning from analogy is a failure, because no analogy exists. Water, being a material substance, may be formed by combining its chemical elements; but life, intellect, sensibility, and will are not material in their nature and it is unsound reasoning that assumes they may be derived from purely material elements.

Again, materialists attempt to reason by analogy from the conservation of forces, and because physical forces are convertible that physical forces may be converted into thought. The sum of physical forces is always the same. They may be changed from one form to another, but never diminished or increased. Motion produces heat, and that heat is sufficient to produce motion equal in amount to that which produces the heat. Further, it is assumed that these same laws apply to mental forces. Then it is reasoned that as heat may be converted to motion, so motion may be converted to thought and vitality. But again the materialist's argument fails of proof because of its lack of analogy. It fails to prove that thought is produced by motion. When materialistic scientists go into their laboratories and by combining carbonic acid, water, and ammonia produce a living organism and demonstrate with it that by the motion of atoms thought is produced, then their reasoning from analogy may be taken seriously.

Every argument heretofore given in proof of theism is an argument against materialism. That the material world is the product of intelligence and will is reasonable, but how absurd is the materialists' theory that these are the product of matter and motion! Tyndall said, "The passage from the physics of the brain to the corresponding facts of consciousness is unthinkable. Granted that a definite thought and a definite molecular

action in the brain occur simultaneously: we do not possess the intellectual organ, nor apparently any rudiment of the organ, which would enable us to pass, by a process of reasoning, from the one phenomenon to the other.'' Materialism has all the defects charged against pantheism as far as religion is concerned. It denies to man's spirit a proper object of worship. Also in denying free will it denies the reality of morality and moral obligation.

V. Naturalistic Evolution

The subject of naturalistic evolution might well have been discussed under the preceding heading, Materialism, except for the fact that it is so widely prevalent and so distinct as a theory as to deserve separate treatment. It is true that some naturalistic evolutionists, including one so prominent as Huxley, repudiate the charge of materialism; but it is not because they believe in a distinction between matter and mind, but rather because they deny the reality of both matter and spirit as being anything of which we may have any real knowledge and admit them only as imaginary grounds for phenomena. Or they sometimes attempt to deny the charge of materialism, by an appeal to a new definition of matter as inclusive of mind. In the ordinary sense of the term ''matter,'' naturalistic evolution is materialistic. But whether it is regarded as materialistic or not, it is certainly antitheistic, and should be discussed in connection with antitheistic theories as such. Evolution as a theory will be dealt with in the proper place. Here the only purpose is a criticism of the antitheistic aspect of the theory.

1. **Evolution Hypothesis.**—Briefly stated, the theory of evolution is that all nature, inorganic and organic, or non-living and living, has been developed from a lower or simpler form by the agency of forces resident in that simpler form. The theory assumes to account for the present orderly formations of the earth from primitive nebulæ, and also for the formation and movements of all the heavenly bodies from the same form of matter and by means of resident forces. This is the nebular hypothesis of Laplace, but it is incorporated as a part of the evolutionary theory in its broadest aspect. In its narrower sense, the evolution theory attempts to account for the various species of plant and animal life on the theory that the present species have been evolved from lower species principally by a

process called natural selection, or the "survival of the fittest" in the struggle for existence.

The evolutionary hypothesis now so popular is of comparatively modern origin. Though Lamark published evolutional views as early as 1801 and evolution was hinted at by others still earlier, yet the subject received but little attention until the publication, in 1859, of the Origin of Species, by Charles Darwin. Darwin was seconded by A. R. Wallace, and his main theory was supported by such early evolutionists as Huxley, Haeckel, Hooker, and especially Herbert Spencer, one who contributed probably as much to the theory as did Darwin. Since that time the theory has been widely advocated in varying forms. In its beginning it was to a great extent atheistic, like its supporters; and it has continued to the present to maintain generally atheistic tendencies.

In the consideration of the evolution theory two questions arise. The first is the question as to the actuality of origin of species by means of evolution. The second question is concerning the cause or law of such evolution if it is actual. Concerning the first, evolutionists suppose that eons ago the first protoplasmic cell originated, under favorable conditions, in an environment of sea-water. Through long geological periods, it is said, these cells very slowly but gradually developed, by means of inherent forces, into all the varied forms of life that have appeared upon the earth. The ancestor of man and of the ape (for it is commonly supposed that the ape is not man's parent but his cousin), it is said, appeared probably about sixty million years ago as one type of organism of the many that had been developed from the first life. Through change of environment and conditions of life, it is affirmed, man in his present high form has been evolved. But let it be remembered that this is only a "scientific" hypothesis or theory. It has not been proved, nor is it known actually to have taken place. True science regards it as being only a theory, and as long as many scientists deny it as being proved and actual, certainly theology should not build greatly upon it. What science demands of religion we may as properly demand of it, that it do not build on the imaginative and pure assumptions.

Regarding the cause of this evolutionary change a variety of opinions have been advanced by those who assume evolution as

a reality. Environment has been much stressed as a cause and sexual selection has received much attention, but natural selection, which may be defined by the much used phrase coined by Herbert Spencer, "the survival of the fittest," is the most generally assumed cause. According to this theory, in the struggle for existence in times of stress the weaker die and the stronger members of species survive and propagate a higher type of their species. This is believed to be a fair representation of the theory as held by evolutionists. It is worthy of notice that improvement of species is the result of a law of selfishness, and if mankind generally should come to obey the Golden Rule, which is doubtless the highest principle of duty dictated by men's moral reason and most conducive to the happiness of those who observe it, then man will cease to evolve. The tendency to help the weak, to build hospitals, infirmaries, and asylums, and to conduct many other forms of benevolent work must certainly result in the eventual retrogression of the human species to one as low or lower than the ape. How strange that the welfare of the race should require the abnegation of the noblest sentiments it has ever known! Surely the mere statement of such a theory is sufficient refutation of it.

2. **Naturalistic and Theistic Evolution.**—It is proper and a matter of fairness in view of what will be stated later to make a distinction between theories of evolution. They may be divided into two main classes—naturalistic and theistic. Naturalistic evolution disallows any divine creative work in the formation of the universe but refers all to nature and forces resident in it. Theistic evolution admits a supernatural element or divine operation either at the beginning of the process or superintending it throughout. It agrees with naturalistic evolution as to the question of the fact of evolution, but differs radically with the naturalistic theory concerning the cause of that assumed evolution of the various forms of life. Theistic evolutionists differ as to the nature and extent of the divine operation in the imagined evolutionary process. One class assumes divine creations of the first life, of man's body, and of man's soul at the proper points in the process. Others regard evolution as God's method of creating, instead of by definite fiats, and assume that he constantly superintends such development and that it is not by mere natural forces. A third view, which might be called

semitheistic, is that God vitalized a few simple forms at the beginning and that from these have evolved, by forces of nature alone, all other forms that have appeared. This is essentially the view of Darwin.

Theistic evolution may somewhat modify the proofs of theism but in no sense does it weaken them. That Being who can directly effect the marvelous forms of nature by a process of development under divine supervision, or who can create simple organisms and endow them with power to evolve the highly organized species of the present time, is certainly just as real and as truly personal as any conception of him can be. Therefore inasmuch as it leaves the positive argument for theism in all its strength, theistic evolution need not be considered further in a discussion of antitheistic theories. However, it may be said that even theistic evolution is objectionable to true religion, because (1) it is contradictory to the Bible record of creation; (2) it is false to the true sense of divine providence; (3) it usually disallows many of the great fundamentals of true religion such as the fall of man, original sin, and redemption; (4) to whatever extent evolution as being a fact is unproved, it is a mere speculative theory unworthy of the wide influence in religion its abettors accord to it; and (5) as has been demonstrated by its history from its beginning, its tendency is constantly to gravitate to the antitheistic and antireligious.

The purely naturalistic theory of evolution is, in its nature, antitheistic. To disallow a divine element in creation is to disallow God; for if God is not creator, what is he? And what rightful claim does he have on us for worship and obedience to his law? If he created us, we owe him love and loyalty; but if he has no such claim upon us, his requirements are nothing short of injustice and he is a usurper. Naturalistic evolution is not only antitheistic but also antireligious, if religion is defined in any real sense. In its denial of God it necessarily denies the real divinity of Christ and divine revelation in the Scriptures. In rejecting a divine creation of man it makes him a purely material being void of a supersensuous soul; it disallows man's fall, depravity, redemption, divine providence, the propriety of prayer and worship, and, if it is consistent, life after death. Consequently its supporters deny the divine element in the Bible, the virgin birth and divinity of Christ, supernatural

conversion, miracles, and hope of happiness after death, and instead advocate an antisupernatural social religion that looks only to the affairs that concern this life. Probably most of the modern antitheism allies itself with this naturalistic evolution.

3. **Difficulties of Naturalistic Evolution.**—Insoluble perplexities confront the naturalistic theory of evolution at very important points in its supposed process. Its supporters may say science is not obligated to assign original causes; but it may be properly answered that reason does ask for a first cause and that naturalistic evolution, in attempting to meet the requirements of reason, has assigned as cause what it can not prove to be an adequate cause, and with its failure to explain certain problems confronting it, reason must reject it.

(1) *It Fails to Account for the Fire-mist.*—The theory of naturalistic evolution begins with the nebula, or fire-mist, and the perplexities of the theory begin there, too. It undertakes to build the whole structure of organic creation on the nebular hypothesis. Evolution is an unproved theory based upon another unproved theory. It is much given to assumptions. Religion has been charged with depending upon tradition and assumption, but even if these charges could be proved the assumptions of religion would not be nearly so unreasonable as the assumptions of this theory that is supported in the name of science. It assumes that the present orderly universe once existed in its entirety, both its matter and also its force, in a fiery cloud. This is the only material it allows itself out of which to evolve all the high and complex forms of existence in the universe, even including man himself. According to the theory this wonderful mist went to work and, without any guiding intelligence, formed out of itself the sidereal universe, embracing suns with planets and satellites all representing wonderful exactness of balance and motion and on at least one of those planets, by wonderful arrangement, such as one would naturally suppose only an intelligent mind capable of, made conditions suitable to living organisms. But this was only a beginning. This same mist, in its new form, without any aid from any other source whatsoever and possessing no other materials, energy, or directing power than that which at first inhered in that primitive fire-mist, continued its astonishing activity by originating out of itself living plants and animals in all their complexities, and, not stopping

at this remarkable achievement, it formed itself into man and endowed itself with personality—intellect, sensibility, and will. Then it began to think, to feel, and to volitionate. In its new human form this remarkable mist began to reason out philosophies, to develop fine arts, to produce civilizations and literatures, to build vast empires, to make wonderful inventions, to develop religion and theology (which it later discovered was all wrong), and under the name of science to investigate concerning the nature of itself, and, behold, it made the disappointing discovery that it was nothing but a modified form of fire-mist! In human form it had supposed it was made in the image of God, and that Jesus Christ, its noblest representative, of unimpeachable character and spotless conduct, was God incarnate; but it learned he also was only fire-mist!

Such is exactly what the theory of naturalistic evolution assumes for the primitive fire-mist, and it dare not allow the operation of any outside influence, else it loses its naturalistic character. Appropriating the words of Tyndall when urging for a new definition of matter, "Surely the mere statement of such a notion is more than a refutation. But the hypothesis would probably go even farther than this. Many who hold it would probably assent to the position that, at the present moment, all our philosophy, all our poetry, all our science, and all our art —Plato, Shakespeare, Newton, and Raphael—are potential in the fires of the sun. We long to learn something of our origin. If the evolution hypothesis be correct, even this unsatisfied yearning must have come to us across the ages which separate the unconscious primeval mist from the consciousness of today. I do not think that any holder of the evolution hypothesis would say that I overstate or overstrain it in any way. I merely strip it of all vagueness, and bring it before you, unclothed and unvarnished, the notions by which it must stand or fall. Surely these notions represent an absurdity too monstrous to be entertained by any sane mind" (Fragments of Science, pp. 453, 454).

But even if reason would allow the entertaining of the idea just described, the naturalistic evolutionist has the responsibility of showing the source of this fire-mist. Science may assume it as primordial, but reason is insistent on having an account of the source of this wonderful mist. If it be said it is eternal, then the question arises, Why did it not ever remain fire-mist? What

caused it to change when it did? If its nature was to change, why did it not change before it did? And assuming their absurd theory to be true and that our evolutionist friends were present as careful observers throughout the process of development from that primitive change in the nebula until the present, *how could they prove that no unseen, spiritual, and personal power was thus operating through nature?* Here is another insurmountable obstacle to naturalistic evolution. With its failure to account for the origin of the universe, naturalistic evolution fails as a disproof of theism.

(2) *It Fails to Account for the Origin of Life.*—In addition to its failure to explain the source of the assumed primitive fire-mist, and the cause of its early operation, naturalistic evolution finds another great difficulty in attempting to show the origin of the first life. In its nature it can not allow divine interposition at this point, as does theistic evolution. All that is, must have sprung entirely from that primitive fire-mist, according to the theory. But inasmuch as life could not have existed in the fire-mist because of the intense heat, then the first life must have come as a result of spontaneous generation. The theory requires spontaneous generation, or life from the non-living. A few supporters of the theory have endeavored to evade the difficulties of spontaneous generation by assuming, like Sir William Thompson, that the first life came to this planet on a meteorite from another planet! But except a divine creator is admitted, the difficulty of spontaneous generation is merely tranferred to another place, but not explained. Even Haeckel, rash as he was, rejected this theory. The assumption of abiogenesis, or life from the non-living, is the common course of naturalistic evolutionists at this point. But the gulf that separates between life and lifeless matter is wide and deep and has never been known to be crossed. Any crossing of this impassable gulf is a mere conjecture of those who deny God. That such is true is admitted by Huxley, who was himself a strong supporter of abiogenesis, and who for this reason as well as because of his expert knowledge of all the facts is an important authority. "The fact is, that at the present moment there is not a shadow of trustworthy direct evidence that abiogenesis does take place, or has taken place, within the period during which the existence of life on the globe is recorded" (Encyclopedia Britannica, "Biology").

That such assumption was the method of Haeckel, another prominent advocate of abiogenesis, is shown by the following: "Here I will say only a few words on the *obscure question* as to the origin of the first life. . . . In the definite limited sense in which I maintain spontaneous generation and *assume it as a necessary hypothesis*. . . . This *assumption* is required by the demand of the human understanding for causality" (Evolution of Man, Vol. II, pp. 30, 31). After admitting that it is an obscure question, he attempts to reason that because the human understanding demands causality therefore the first life must have been by abiogenesis, a thing contradictory to both reason and experience! By a similar method but, if possible, by a still more illogical process, Huxley, after admitting no instance of abiogenesis has ever been known, attempts by deduction to prove it has occurred by reasoning that "if the hypothesis of evolution is true, living matter must have arisen from not-living matter." But such reason is no more proof than to say "if it is then it is." His argument proves nothing. He assumes naturalistic evolution and then attempts to deduce abiogenesis as being a fact from that assumption, as if assumption could possibly furnish proof of a fact.

That the failure to find proof of spontaneous generation is fatal to naturalistic evolution is shown by the efforts of its advocates to produce such evidence. Haeckel supposes the first forms of life, which he calls monera, were of the nature of a slime formed in an environment of sea-water by an accidental combination of certain chemicals in proper proportions for its production. On the ground of this theory many scientists attempted for years to generate life by chemical processes, but without avail. A certain writer mentions an instance of one scientist who caused widespread interest by the announcement that he had generated life from the non-living, in a sealed bottle, after he had first destroyed all life in it, as he supposed, by applying heat to it. But the falsity of the claim was later manifested when more careful scientists made similar tests but used more thorough measures for the extinction of life in the sealed bottle, with the result that no life was generated. Huxley said on this subject of present attempts to generate life from inorganic matter: "It may be stated as a well-based induction, that the more careful the investigator, and the more complete his mastery over

the endless practical difficulties which surround experimentation on this subject, the more certain are his experiments to give a negative result; while positive results are no less sure to crown the efforts of the clumsy and careless'' (Encyclopedia Britannica, ''Biology''). No spontaneous generation of life has ever yet been known to occur, and it is reasonable to believe that it never will occur. It is a well-recognized fact with science that life comes only from life. In the words of that great scientist Louis Pasteur, ''In the present state of knowledge the doctrine of spontaneous generation is a chimera'' (Pasteur and His Work, p. 62).

(3) *It Fails to Account for Man's Body.*—The failure of evolution to prove spontaneous generation of life from the nonliving is weakening to the theory. The failure of proof of the theory at a point so vital to it is reason enough for asking that it give proof of other important points on which it rests. Especially is proof demanded that man is evolved from the lower animals. The theory requires that he was so evolved. But if a theistic cause is allowed for animal life, then who can say that divine intervention may not be the cause of man, both body and spirit? Man differs from all lower animals, not only in the high grade of his mental powers, but also in bodily form and stature. This wide difference between man and lower animals can not be allowed to have resulted from a sudden leap, because the evolution theory requires very gradual changes. The theory requires, then, that there must have been literally millions of transitional forms that lived during millions of years leading up to man from that early animal ancestor of men and apes, or to the man-ape as others suppose. If these transitional forms or links between men and animals ever lived upon the earth, as evolution assumes, there would necessarily be many traces of them in fossilized skeletal remains in the geological strata formed during or since the time they lived, as there are of animals of the earlier periods. Remains of animals are found in large numbers; but of these supposed intermediate forms between men and animals, of which there must have been very many both of kinds and number, not one can be found. Thoughtful minds may therefore consistently doubt whether they ever existed.

That such remains have not been found, and also that man does not bear marks of having been descended from the ape or

other lower animal, is declared as follows by James D. Dana, one of the most eminent of geologists and also for some time professor of natural history in Yale University: "The interval between the monkey and man is one of the greatest. The capacity of the brain in the lowest of men is 68 cubic inches, while that in the highest man ape is but 34. Man is erect in posture, and has this erectness marked in the form and position of all his bones, while the man ape has his inclined posture forced on him by every bone of his skeleton. The highest of man apes can not walk, except for a few steps, without holding on by his fore limbs; and, instead of having a double curvature in his back like man, which well-balanced erectness requires, he has but one. The connecting links between man and any man ape of past geological time have not been found, although earnestly looked for. No specimen of the stone age that has yet been discovered is inferior, as already remarked, to the lowest of existing men; and none is intermediate in essential characters between man and the man ape. The present teaching of geology very strongly confirms the belief that man is not of nature's making. Independently of such evidence, man's high reason, his unsatisfied aspirations, his free-will, all afford the fullest assurance that he owes his existence to the special act of the Infinite Being whose image he bears" (Geological Story, pp. 289, 290).

It is true that certain fossil remains have been discovered which have been hailed as examples of these supposed intermediate forms; but when carefully examined by experts these have not proved to be such. Notable examples of these are the Engis and Neanderthal skulls. The former was found by Professor Schmerling in a cave in the valley of the Meuse, in Belgium, and the latter in a cave near Dusseldorf. These had been carried into the caves by water, where they were found among other fossils that are supposed to belong to a past geological period. But having been brought together by such a process, it is a great question whether their relation to those other fossils proves that the men to whom they belonged lived at the same period as the animals among whose remains they were found. But whatever may have been their date, that they do not prove what they are often supposed to prove is evident from the statement of Thomas Huxley, who was a leading naturalistic evolu-

tionist, and also a very high authority in anatomy. Of the Engis skull he says, "Its measurements agree equally well with those of some European skulls. And assuredly, there is no mark of degradation about any part of its structure. It is in fact, a fair average human skull, which might have belonged to a philosopher, or might have contained the thoughtless brains of a savage" (Man's Place in Nature, p. 205). He describes the Neanderthal skull as having a brain capacity of 75 cubic inches, or that of the average Polynesian or Hottentot skull. He says it is of a lower type of man than the Engis skull, but that it is nevertheless of a man. "In no sense, then, can the Neanderthal bones be regarded as the remains of a human being intermediate between men and apes" (Ibid., p. 206).

Other fossils that have been regarded by evolutionists as of special value to their theory are the Trinil man and the Dawn man of Dawson. But only small and disconnected parts of these have been found, which, being altogether too meager to constitute proof in a matter so important, fail to prove that intermediate forms between men and man-apes one time existed. That the point is still an open question is evident from the following statement by Dr. John Seliskar (Professor of Psychology at the St. Paul Seminary), as quoted by Dr. Arvid Reuterdahl (President, Ramsey Institute of Technology, St. Paul, Minnesota), under "International Science Briefs" in the Dearborn Independent of July 21, 1923: "The direct evidences so far advanced in proof of the animal descent of man, are not of the character to create, after unbiased investigation, a conviction that would satisfy an unbiased mind. The *anthropithekoi* and the *homosimians,* reconstructed from fragmentary skeletal remains, have not always been treated with kindness by members of the scientific profession. The so-called Trinil man (*pithecanthropus erectus*), discovered by Eugene Dubois in 1891, is classified in three different ways by archeologists. One group considers him entirely human, another altogether simian [ape] and a third as homosimian. The Dawn man of Dawson, unearthed in England, has in his reconstructed form served as a model of the ape-man. Arthur Keith, of the British Museum, examined the physiognomy and discovered that the cranium and jaw do not belong together, as the space for a pharynx is almost obliterated ("Antiquity of Man," p. 395). Dr. George C.

McCurdy, of Yale University, has arrived at the conclusion that the two parts do not belong to the same individual (*Science,* February 18, 1916). The cranium is human, possessing the capacity of 1,390 cubic centimeters, as calculated by Arthur Keith; and the jaw once belonged to a chimpanzee. The combination should make a number one ape-man. The Neanderthal man is the subject of similar controversies. The transformists have not yet succeeded in discovering a genuine specimen of ape-man. The claim that the evolution of man has been placed beyond the realm of controversy is in no way justified. Science boasts of accepting only tangible evidence as the source of information. If the boast is true, assertions not so substantiated should not be made in the name of science."

With no examples of the actual existence of fossil remains of intermediate forms between man and an animal ancestor, and with no marks of gradation or of an ascending scale among the various ape families, the principal attempts at proof of man's origin from lower animals fail. There is really no proof that man's organic nature is a result of evolution.

(4) *It Fails to Account for the Origin of Mind.*—Insoluble difficulties confront naturalistic evolution, as has been shown in its attempts to account for the primordial fire-mist, the origin of the first life, and the origin of man's organic nature. A fourth difficulty is in accounting for the origin of man's mind from matter which was originally fire-mist. Only that can be evolved which has first been involved. Nothing can arise out of matter not primordially in it. Mind is a faculty of the soul, which is a spiritual essence and is different in its very nature from material things. Material facts or phenomena will not combine with mental facts or phenomena. Reason will not combine with figure or form; thought will not admit of being measured in feet and inches. These are different in their nature and belong to entirely different spheres of being.

That the difficulty here referred to is real is shown by the fact that evolutionists themselves have conceded that matter can not be the ground of mental facts. Tyndall, himself an evolutionist, comments on this point as follows: "For what are the core and essence of this hypothesis? Strip it naked, and you stand face to face with the notion that not alone the more ignoble forms of animalcular or animal life, not alone the noble forms

of the horse and lion, not alone the exquisite and wonderful mechanism of the human body, but that the mind itself—emotion, intellect, will, and all their phenomena—were once latent in a fiery cloud. Surely the mere statement of such a notion is more than a refutation.'' ''These evolution notions are absurd, monstrous, and fit only for the intellectual gibbet, in relation to the ideas concerning matter which were drilled into us when young'' (Fragments of Science, pp. 453, 454). Tyndall here contends for a new definition of matter so that it may furnish a ground for mental facts; but a change of definition of matter would make no change in matter itself. Such a method does not relieve the difficulty of evolutionists in their efforts to show an evolution of mind from matter.

Even though we were credulous enough to accept the theory of the evolutionists that a primordial fire-mist, or matter as we see it today, could transform itself into mind, yet another and still greater difficulty must be met, viz., how did that which had always hitherto been governed by fixed mechanical laws become independent of such laws and acquire free-will? It is evident that man has the power to choose his course of conduct. Necessity can not contradict itself by creating the free. The fact is that naturalistic evolution can give no adequate account of the origin of free will. Neither can it account adequately for conscience in man, which is grounded upon free will. These fundamental qualities of the spiritual man must be accounted for; and upon the failure of naturalistic evolution to account for them in man, it can not stand.

PART II

EVIDENCES OF DIVINE REVELATION OR APOLOGETICS

PART II

EVIDENCES OF DIVINE REVELATION OR APOLOGETICS

Chapter I

PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS AND PRESUMPTIVE EVIDENCES

I. The Proposition to Be Proved

1. **The Question Stated.**—Are there sufficient reasons for believing the Christian Scriptures are the divinely inspired Word of God, or that what the Bible says, God says? Is Christ divine and is his religion of God, as the Scriptures affirm? Christian apologetics answers these questions affirmatively, by setting forth such reasons or evidences. As used in this connection, "apologetics" implies, not an excuse for that which is unjustifiable, but a reason for believing the truth.

Error shrinks from the light, but truth fearlessly welcomes it. Christianity has always invited investigation of its claims. It asks of us no blind faith. It can produce evidence of the truthfulness of all it affirms. Skeptics often base their arguments on unproved assumptions, but Christianity has no need of assuming anything. Like all true science, it needs no other support than that of known facts. Skepticism, then, must be the result of either ignorance of the evidences, or an unwillingness to believe and accept the facts of Christianity. Honest doubters are always such because they are not familiar with the evidences. Even David Hume admitted, as Dr. Johnson says, that he had never read the New Testament attentively. Doubtless there would be fewer skeptics if all would do as did Lord Lyttleton and Gilbert West, who, in order to make their assault on Christianity more effectual, decided first to examine it. But when they came to investigate fairly the evidences, they became believers and defenders of Christianity.

2. **The Incomparable Importance of the Subject.**—The importance of a knowledge of the evidences of Christianity can not well be exaggerated. Such knowledge has a great bearing on, not only our highest duty, but also our present and eternal welfare. The claims and requirements of Christianity should be

of the most vital concern to every man. No one can consistently be indifferent about them. Even the most devout Christian, though ever so well satisfied in his own heart that the Bible is God's Word, ought, nevertheless, to be familiar with the evidences of that truth he so unquestioningly accepts. One may believe the truth because he has been taught it by others; but it is better that he shall be "able to give a reason" for his belief. Without a reason he may easily become prey to skepticism, if he should come in contact with such influences. Others are convinced of the truth because of the power of Christianity miraculously manifested in their own hearts in Christian experience. This is doubtless the very best of proof and most direct. But such evidences alone will not enable one successfully to defend his belief against the subtle arguments of the infidel, and sometimes will not even save him from a considerable amount of intellectual confusion. The Christian ought to be thoroughly familiar with the facts that support his most holy faith. Such knowledge will strengthen his convictions, and keep him from being easily led astray. It will increase his confidence and strengthen him for service. It will enable him better to propagate the truth and to convince others. It will give him much pleasure to know the many infallible proofs of the divine authority of the Scriptures. In view of these advantages, it may properly be said it is the duty of every Christian to study the evidences of Christianity.

And if the investigation of the proofs of Christianity are important for him who already believes, how much more important must it be for those who have doubts on the subject or who definitely reject Christianity. Surely doubters should make every possible effort to know all the facts before committing themselves to open infidelity. For ought it not appear possible to them that their doubts are groundless in view of the fact that many of the best men of the past and present—men of broad minds and keen insight, much learning, careful discrimination, and unquestioned honesty—have been earnest believers? How serious their error if they should some day awaken to the fact that they had rejected the Word of their Creator and spent their lives and used their influence against him!

Also another reason why this study is important is that it is not a matter of discriminating between Christianity and a

religion nearly as good, but of choosing between Christianity and no religion at all. For if we reject Christ and the Bible, "to whom shall we go?" Certainly one could not prefer to plunge into the dark abyss of heathenism. And who, after viewing the incomparable excellence of the doctrinal and moral teachings of the Bible, could prefer in exchange the unrighteous teachings of the false prophet of Arabia as found in the Koran? It is not characteristic of those who have rejected the exalted religion of Christ to do a thing so preposterous. They have attempted to substitute deism, or "natural religion," by rejecting the Scriptures and Christ and yet holding theism. But deism has proved to be the greatest failure of any system that ever professed to be a religion. In France it had as good an opportunity to prove its worth as could be possible. It was supported by the government, it was approved by the leaders of influence, and was accepted by the people. It appropriated the Christian houses of worship. It was thoroughly organized and set going. But it had no power and no soul, and was soon acknowledged by one of the leaders of the country as being far inferior to that for which it had been exchanged.

The subject is too important to be studied with any prejudice. Its investigation should be impartial and scientific. But because of men's depravity of heart, too often they do not study this subject as they would a question of history or science. They are often unwilling that the Bible should be proved to be the Word of God because they do not wish to feel obligated to obey it. It demands submission, and man's proud heart rebels. But Christianity promises knowledge of the truth only to those who desire to obey it. It is inconsistent with present probation that the evidences of the truth should be such as would compel belief on the part of those who prefer to doubt. A further reason why men reject the Bible is because it demands acceptance as a revelation freely given of God; the pride of men's hearts leads them to prefer to reason out their own philosophies instead. Rather than to receive truth as a gift, they prefer to discover, because it reflects more honor on themselves. The truly honest seeker for truth will come to the investigation in the humble attitude of a learner. He will accept facts and facts only. He will follow the method of Newton in seeking for and holding to facts.

He will not be hasty in coming to a decision, but will learn the facts and then deliberately draw proper conclusions.

3. **Present-day Task of Apologetics.**—From its beginning, Christianity has had its claims opposed by skeptics and defended by apologists. The objections of these opposers have always been of the same general character, but have varied much in details. Likewise, the evidences set forth by Christian apologists have ever been of the same general nature, but the methods of using them and the placing of emphasis have varied to meet the nature of particular attacks. The defenses of Christianity of the present day must be such as will meet the present assault by skeptics. Four periods may be distinguished in the history of apologetics.

(1) The earliest preachers addressed their message to the Jews, and in answer to the Jewish objections that Jesus was not their promised Messiah appealed to the correspondence between the Old Testament prophecies and the events in the life of Jesus.

(2) When the apostles and others began the propagation of Christianity among the heathen, another form of skepticism confronted them. The doctrine of one God was denied, the Scriptures were rejected as being a divine revelation, and Christianity was rejected as the one true religion. Prominent opposers of Christianity of that period were Celsus and Porphyry. This heathen skepticism was answered by such Christian writers as Justin Martyr, Tatian, and Athenagoras by appeals to the transforming power of Christianity. The experimental proofs seem to have been largely used as Christian evidence at that time, although other arguments were used in a measure.

(3) Another period of apologetics came as a result of the rise of deism in the eighteenth century. Lord Herbert advocated a natural religion in which he denied all that is distinctively Christian, although he professed belief in theism. David Hume later advocated universal skepticism. The result was English deism, German rationalism, and French infidelity. But the strong tide of skepticism was stemmed successfully by Christianity. Able apologists set forth the evidences of Christianity with a thoroughness never before known. Eminent among these were Joseph Butler and William Paley. Butler's "Analogy of Religion" and Paley's "Evidences of Christianity" did much to turn back the tide of infidelity and restore men's faith in the Bible.

(4) But at the present day, while the infidelity of two hundred years ago is not at all extinct, unbelief has arisen in another form—that of the destructive higher criticism. In this form infidelity professes to be Christian, but is strongly rationalistic. It denies any such inspiration of the Scriptures as constitutes them in any real sense the Word of God, or an authoritative revelation of truth. It also denies the divinity of Christ, as well as all other supernatural manifestations described in the Scriptures. It commonly allies itself with materialistic evolution, and often has a strong antitheistic tendency. To meet the skepticism of the present, then, Christian apologetics must adapt the arguments used in the past or produce others to support the truth on those points where it is being assaulted.

II. Nature and Classification of Evidences

1. Probable, Not Demonstrative, Proofs.—Some truths are of such a nature that their truthfulness can be demonstrated and the proof of these truths is such that the opposite is not conceivable. As an example, the fact is self-evident and capable of demonstration that the sum of the three angles of a triangle is equal to two right angles, or that two parallel lines however long will never meet. Other facts equally true and capable of proof can not be demonstrated, but are proved by probable evidences. All historical facts are dependent upon such proof. And inasmuch as the giving of Christian revelation and the origin of Christianity took place in the past, the evidences of Christianity are probable, not demonstrative. But probable proofs may furnish as great certainty as demonstrative proofs, if the evidence is sufficient. As certainly as we know the facts already mentioned as being capable of demonstration, so certainly we know by means of probable evidences that George Washington was the first President of the United States, that Napoleon Bonaparte lived, and that Abraham Lincoln signed the Proclamation of Emancipation and died at the hand of an assassin. So, likewise, as these things can be known certainly by probable evidence, the divine origin of the Bible and Christianity may be certainly known by evidences of a similar nature, if those evidences are sufficient in themselves. Skeptics and young persons not accustomed to weighing evidence who require demonstrative evidences of the divine origin of Christianity are unreasonable in their demands.

It should also be considered that the proofs of Christianity are not to be taken singly, but together. This is an important rule in weighing probable evidences. The strength of Christian evidence lies especially in its cumulative nature. The vast amount of evidence all pointing in the same direction has the value of a demonstration.

2. **Rational and Authenticating Evidences.**—Another important distinction necessary for properly weighing the evidences, but one commonly disregarded by rationalistic skeptics of the present time, is that between rational and authenticating evidences. Rational evidence shows why a thing must be true. Authenticating evidence shows why we should believe it is true. Rational evidences are employed in supporting those truths that belong to "natural religion" such as the existence of God, moral distinctions, free will, and immortality. Authenticating evidences attest a messenger or message as of God and show why we should accept the message on the ground of that testimony. Examples of authenticating evidences are miracles and prophecy. This kind of evidences is the sole support of those truths of "revealed religion" such as the Trinity, atonement, and pardon. Modern rationalists do the unreasonable thing of rejecting all that their limited understandings can not reason out as truth, and ignore the fact that there may be good reasons for believing a proposition true though one can not see any reason why it is true except that it is affirmed by a well-attested witness. Christian apologetics properly employs both classes of evidences.

3. **Main Classes of Positive Evidences.**—Various classifications may be made of the evidences of Christianity. For our purpose they may be grouped in four main divisions much as was done by Paley in his "Evidences," and as has been done by many others since. They are as follows: (1) External evidences, including the authenticity and credibility of the Scriptures, miracles, and prophecy. (2) Internal evidences, which reason from the degree of perfection of the doctrinal and moral standards of the Bible, its adaptation to man's needs, its harmony with nature, the harmony of its parts, and the character of Christ. (3) Experimental evidences, which appeal to the effects of Christianity on believers' hearts and lives. (4) Collateral evidences, which reason from the rapid spread of Christianity when first propagated, its effects on society where propagated, and its

acceptance by eminent persons. These four classes are sometimes called "positive" evidences.

Another class of proofs not to be despised is that sometimes designated "presumptive" evidences. It reasons that because a revelation is possible to God, and man needs it, therefore it is not unreasonable to suppose it has been made; and it further reasons that because the Bible agrees with what one may properly presuppose such revelation should contain, therefore it is that revelation from God.

III. Probability of a Divine Revelation

1. **Possibility of Revelation.**—No one who believes in the existence of a personal God can consistently deny the possibility of his giving a revelation of truth to man. Those who object to revelation on the ground of its impossibility do so, in nearly every instance, because they hold a pantheistic or similar antitheistic conception of God. The free, personal cause of nature is certainly not so limited by nature that he can not do what he would in revealing himself. Certainly the author of speech can speak; and even though he is a purely spiritual being, he is not limited so that he can not communicate with human spirits in union with material bodies. It is sometimes objected that because man is finite in knowledge he can not receive a revelation from the Omniscient One. This would be true if finite man must stretch himself up to the infinite; but if it is a matter of the omniscient God adapting his message to the finite mind of man, the difficulty vanishes.

2. **Necessary as a Standard of Right.**—It is a reasonable presupposition that God would wish to speak to the creatures he created in his own image, especially in view of the fact that man is so greatly in need of a revelation. Only by divine revelation can men know many truths necessary for their highest good and God's glory. In all ages they have recognized their need of divine revelation, and Socrates, wise as he was, expressed a hope that such a revelation would be given.

A standard of belief and duty is needed; but because of man's present perverted moral nature, his conscience is not a satisfactory guide. Human reason and philosophy are insufficient, as is evident from the fact that men's opinions constantly conflict. Even though it were possible to know the truth sufficiently by

philosophy, yet the large proportion of men would be incapable of thus finding it. The heathen world of both the past and present, with all their philosophies, is a witness to the need of a revelation. Their moral and religious intuitions need to be supplemented by a message from God. Their wisest philosophers have often gone far astray religiously. Their greatest moralists have often been immoral and have taught contrary to true moral standards. Socrates urged divination, and was given to fornication. Plato taught that to lie is honorable. Cato was a drunkard, and recommended and practised suicide. Seneca approved fornication, and advocated and practised self-murder. These who are cited as heathenism's greatest teachers and examples of morality missed the mark widely. Surely a revelation is needed to know the way of right.

3. **Necessary for Pardon of Sin.**—All men have a feeling of moral obligation to God. They recognize intuitively that some things are morally right and others are morally wrong. The feeling is also common among men everywhere that they have sinned, are guilty, and deserve penalty. But is no pardon possible for this world of lost sinners? Nature gives no reason for expecting pardon. Her laws are inexorable. No pardon is granted their violators. He who sticks his hand into the fire will be burned. He who thrusts a knife into his heart will die. Or he who steps off a precipice is dashed into pieces. Reasoning from nature's laws, one can not consistently expect pardon. Also in reasoning from the requirements of God's perfect government it can not be supposed that moral law may be violated with impunity. It is right that the sinner should suffer the penalty. If sinners go unpunished, how can God's law be respected? Even though God is sole sovereign, yet he may not properly pardon by divine prerogative if he is to govern righteously. But yet man must be pardoned if he is to be happy. He feels instinctively that pardon is possible through the goodness of God. But how can it be? Reason forbids it. Nature and reason give no hint of atonement. That wonderful truth is brought to men only through divine revelation. Only there is the way of salvation pointed out. Then the fact that man needs pardon, and that the way to find it may not be known by any other means, is strong reason for expecting a divine revelation.

4. **Necessary to the Understanding of Providence and Prayer.**—

A knowledge of the nature of divine providence is important in order to draw out men's highest love for their Creator and to develop in them that loving trust in God which is essential to their happiness. They need to know that God loves them, that his watchful eye is over them, that through his fatherly care they enjoy the benefits that come to them. But nature does not make clear enough what is the relation of God to his creation that men may have ground for trust for and appreciation of his benefits. Therefore, because it is needed both for man's happiness and God's glory, a revelation showing these things is antecedently probable.

Men everywhere have a disposition to pray; and prayer, like religion, is almost universal. It has been affirmed that every man prays at some time in life. The practise of prayer seems to spring from an implanted tendency. But without a divine revelation, how may one know that God will hear and answer? All we can learn of God in nature would lead us to assume that God's dealings with us can not be changed by prayer. Reason would conclude that the all-wise ruler of the universe could not change his course at the asking of any one of his millions of creatures without great confusion everywhere. In harmony with such a conclusion, deists are characteristically prayerless persons. Still men intuitively feel they should pray. But will prayer be answered? What is its purpose? How much should one pray? What constitutes acceptable prayer? That these questions may be answered by revelation only is attested by the "vain repetitions" of both the ancient and modern heathen with their various mechanical devices for praying, and repeated prostrations of themselves before their idols. Therefore, because prayer is important to man's happiness and God's glory, and we can not know how to pray except by revelation, it is a reasonable presumption that such a divine revelation would be given.

IV. Marks of Divine Revelation to Be Expected Characterize the Scriptures

The antecedent probability of a divine revelation thus far discussed is not a reason for assuming the Christian Scriptures are that revelation, but merely reason for assuming the probability of such revelation. Our reasoning so far indicates a probability only of such a revelation as might have been given

orally to the patriarchs prior to Moses or to other individuals. That the Scriptures are the presupposed revelation is to be shown later by positive proofs. But before passing on to those evidences it is desirable to consider the presumptive proofs that the Scriptures are that antecedently probable revelation. The method is to consider what may be reasonably expected to be the nature and characteristics of a divine revelation, and then to show that the Scriptures bear such marks.

1. **Probable Contents of Divine Revelation.**—A revelation adequate to the need must (1) furnish a holy and benevolent object of worship and show man's relation to it; (2) show the possibility of pardon of sin without the sacrifice of God's righteous character, and also the conditions by which man may obtain such forgiveness; (3) show the nature of, and conditions for, a restoration of man's depraved nature so that he can live righteously; (4) present a perfect standard of doctrine and morals; (5) reveal the nature and extent of divine providence, and teach us how to pray. The Bible does all this with remarkable clearness. Also it must be adapted to human conditions and understanding generally.

2. **Probable Manner of Divine Revelation.**—Any supernatural giving of truth to man must be in such a manner as is in harmony with the laws of human thought and capacity to comprehend. It is not to be supposed that in giving a revelation, God would contradict or cancel the laws of mind, which he ordained, but adapt his revelation of truth to them. Therefore it is to be expected that man would not be entirely passive in his reception of divine revelation; for mental assimilation requires a certain amount of intellectual activity—otherwise, only a blind impression would be produced. We may properly presuppose, then, that revelation will be given, not merely in words, but also in life and action. Also it must be given gradually, to be understood. It must first set forth the simple and pass on to the more complex and spiritual. Such is the manner and order of the giving of the Scriptures. Also, it must be expressed in writing if it is to be retained and become a general revelation of divine truth to men. And further, such a revelation must be expressed first to particular persons of a particular nation, and by them passed on to the whole world.

3. **Probable Attestation of Divine Revelation.**—No such revela-

tion as that supposed could be worthy of acceptance except it be sufficiently attested as coming from God. It must be supernaturally revealed, and it must bear the marks of supernatural origin as a testimony to those to whom it is directed. There must be proof that it is from the infinite God, creator of nature, and who is known through nature to exist. There can be no better evidence than the manifestation of miracles transcending the powers of nature, that the giver of the revelation in connection with which they occur is the author of nature and is of infinite power. Also, nothing can more surely attest the infinite wisdom and foreknowledge of the author of a revelation than the utterance in it of predictions of future events which later come to pass in detail. The Scriptures bear abundant marks of such supernatural attestation.

In conclusion, then, it may be said that instead of an antecedent improbability precluding the idea of revelation, as skeptics sometimes affirm, there is a very strong antecedent probability of a divine revelation to men. And not only is a revelation antecedently probable, but in view of the reasonable presuppositions of what should be the contents, method, and attestation of such a revelation, it is also antecedently probable that the Christian Scriptures are that revelation. To admit these grounds of probability practically requires the admission of the Scriptures as of divine authority. It is not here affirmed that these presumptive evidences are conclusive in themselves, but they do nullify the presumption against revelation, thus showing that the question to be discussed is properly within the province of logical discussion, and they furnish a good basis for the positive arguments to follow.

Chapter II

EXTERNAL EVIDENCES

The difficulties of the Christian apologist do not lie in the direction of scarcity of evidences, nor in any lack of strength in the proofs, but rather in the difficulty of discrimination in selecting from the vast mass of the many kinds and great numbers of positive evidences such as his limited space will permit and of so arranging and presenting those facts that the reader receives the definite impression that the weight of the evidence and the importance of the subject justify.

The two principal classes of external, or historical, evidences are miracles and fulfilled prophecy. The particular examples of miracles and prophecies are very many and from these divine interventions the attestation of the Scriptures may be shown. These signs and wonders and fulfilled prophecies are constantly appealed to by the Scriptures as proofs that God was with those who professed to speak in his name. And they are perfectly valid proof of the divine authority of the Scriptures. To those who were eye-witnesses of the miracles of Jesus and his apostles, the evidence that they were messengers from God was immediate and convincing. But to those living in subsequent ages, such proofs have value only when positive proof of the credibility of the witnesses reporting such miracles is given and when it is proved that their testimony has been accurately transmitted to those of later ages. But with certain proof of these two things, those miracles properly have the same evidential value to us today as they had to those ancient eye-witnesses. The need for proof of the genuineness and credibility of the Scriptures as a ground for prophecy as Christian evidence is much the same as for miracles. Therefore, not only as distinct branches of external evidences, but also as being prerequisite to Scripture miracles and prophecy as evidence of the divine authority of the Scriptures today, it is required that we show first the genuineness of the Scriptures, or that they were written by their reputed authors; that we show next their integrity, or that they have been transmitted to us from their authors substantially uncorrupted; and finally, that we show the credibility of the writers, or that they were dependable and truthful in recording the facts. There must be no missing links in the evidence. We have no need of begging

the question. Skeptics sometimes do try begging the question, or resorting to misrepresentation of the facts; but Christian apologetics requires only the plain facts fairly considered to establish its claims.

I. Genuineness of the New Testament

What are the proofs that the books of the New Testament were written by their reputed authors, or that they were not forged at a later date as the works of those whose names they bear? This is the question of the genuineness of the New Testament. A genuine document is one written by him whose name it bears, and is the opposite of a spurious writing. For the purpose of condensing the argument, proof is attempted only of the New Testament writings, as this is all that is immediately essential to our purpose; and, also, when the divine authority of the New Testament is proved, that of the Old Testament must necessarily be assumed, because the New constantly affirms the divine authority of the Old Testament.

1. **Method of Showing Genuineness.**—The method employed for determining the genuineness of any other book of a past age is that to be employed in proving the genuineness of the New Testament. This method is the tracing of its history back to the time of its reputed author.

A famous religious allegory is extant today entitled "The Pilgrim's Progress," and is reputed to be the writing of John Bunyan. But what is the proof that it is the product of that great preacher of three hundred years ago? First, copies of various early editions of it may be found in the British Museum inscribed with his name. Also, it is not only now universally received as Bunyan's work, but every age since his time has always attributed it to him. Even the age in which he lived accepted it as his work. Writers of every subsequent age mention it and quote it as being unquestionably from him.

In its literary style and its descriptions it bears the marks characteristic of Bunyan's time and country. Also, its spirit and teachings are in exact harmony with religious standards of the Puritanism of that period of which Bunyan was a prominent preacher. Such evidence is equally determinative of the genuineness of a book whether it was written three hundred years ago or two thousand years ago. And it is by evidence of this nature that

the authorship of all the great writings of past ages is ascertained, if it is known at all, whether those be classical writings of Greeks and Romans, or sacred writings of Hebrews and Christians. Neither does the New Testament require a different kind of evidence of its genuineness because of its religious character.

The New Testament writings may be traced in all Christian literature back to the days of the apostles. The proof of genuineness is various in kind and large in quantity. Sir Isaac Newton, whose very name is a synonym for loyalty to facts, not theory, said, "I find more sure marks of authenticity in the New Testament, than in any profane history whatever."

2. **Genuineness Affirmed by Early Church Fathers.**—No proof is needed that the New Testament has existed under the names of its several authors from the fourth century to the present. Since the canon became finally settled during that century, the genuineness of those writings has been generally accepted. Every one who is at all familiar with the history of the civilized world knows that references to the New Testament are interwoven with the history and literature of the last sixteen hundred years. Also, at least three ancient manuscripts of the New Testament still in existence, bearing the names of their authors, and held as sacred treasures in three of the world's great libraries date their existence from the fourth century. Thus at a single leap we may go back to 325 A. D., within less than two hundred and thirty years of the death of the last of the apostles.

It is needless to give in detail the catalogs or lists of the books of the New Testament published by various councils and individuals during the fourth century. The fourth council of Carthage, in 397 A. D., published such a list as agrees perfectly with the canon of the New Testament as we know it today. So also do the lists agree published about the same time by the great theological writer Augustine, and the learned Latin father Jerome. Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, who flourished 315 A. D., published in his "Ecclesiastical History" a list of the books of the New Testament that agrees exactly with our New Testament both as to books and authors. Although he states the Epistles of James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Revelation were questioned by some, he states they were generally received, and he accepts them himself.

Passing on to the third century, we find proofs of genuineness

similar to those already mentioned of the fourth century. Origen, who flourished about 230 A. D. and who was born 184 A. D., less than one hundred years after the death of the apostle John, was probably the most learned in the Scriptures of any of the Greek fathers. According to Jerome, he had the Scriptures by heart. One living so near the time of the apostles and of such wide knowledge must necessarily be regarded as possessing dependable information concerning the authorship of the New Testament. He gives a list of the New Testament books which includes none not accepted today and all of those we recognize except the Epistles of James and Jude; but his omission of these was evidently unintentional, as he in other places expressly acknowledges them as belonging to the canon.

Going still farther back into the last half of the second century, we find among the names of eminent church fathers that of Tertullian, who was born about 150 A. D., which was less than fifty-five years after the last apostle. Being a voluminous writer in defense of Christianity, he quoted much from the New Testament, including all its books except four of the shorter epistles, and as he gave no list of accepted New Testament books, there is no reason for supposing he doubted these. Irenæus, born 120 A. D., disciple of Polycarp, who was personally acquainted with the apostle John, testifies that each of the four Gospels were written by their reputed authors. This is very direct evidence. Also Justin Martyr, who died 148 A. D., quotes from the Gospels, and Papias, born 80 A. D., who was a "hearer of John" and a disciple of Polycarp, gives valuable testimony to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark as being by their reputed authors. These are but a few of the proofs that might be given, but they are surely sufficient to establish the authorship of the New Testament for any reasonable mind. But let us finish this line of evidence.

They were accepted as genuine by the apostolic fathers. The apostolic fathers are those church fathers who came into touch personally with the apostles themselves. The genuine writings of at least three of these have come down to us—Clement of Rome, died 101 A. D., Polycarp, died 166 A. D.; and Ignatius, martyred 107 A. D. These three alone have left us in their writings over one hundred quotations from the New Testament representing every book but four (2 Peter, Jude, 2 and 3 John).

These early writers confirm the authorship of the New Testament books and regard them with the greatest of respect. This is conclusive proof of the genuineness of the New Testament books.

Thus we have traced the records of the New Testament documents back to the very time when the apostles lived. The evidence for genuineness is complete. There is not a missing link. Though but a few catalogs and other quotations from among many of the church fathers are mentioned, yet the evidence given is probably fifty times stronger than that for any Greek or Roman classic. These classics are accepted as genuine. Why, then, may we not accept the New Testament as genuine? In the light of the foregoing evidence, how utterly ungrounded is that insinuation of a certain class of ignorant skeptics that possibly the New Testament documents were "forged by learned monks during the dark ages"! Also consider how dense was the ignorance of the skeptic Paine, or else how deliberate was his falsehood, when he made the statement, "There was no such book as the New Testament till more than three hundred years after the time that Christ is said to have lived."

3. **Genuineness Insured by Carefulness in Determining the Canon.**—The writing of the New Testament was a gradual process, the several books being written for the immediate purpose of supplying particular needs in the early church. These writings were distributed geographically in many countries or cities throughout the Roman Empire. But inasmuch as they were regarded as authoritative and divinely inspired scriptures along with the Old Testament Scriptures (see 2 Peter 3:16), copies were soon multiplied and distributed among the churches. These writings were gradually collected into one volume known as the New Testament. This collection is definitely mentioned by Tertullian, who was born only a little more than fifty-five years after the death of the apostle John, as the "New Testament," composed of two parts, the "gospels and apostles."

But due to the wide scattering of the New Testament documents at first and the slowness of travel and communication at that time, the determining of what was canonical and the collecting of such books into one volume was a process that covered a considerable period of time. Most of the New Testament was generally accepted as canonical in the second century, but it was

not until the fourth century that a few of the books were not questioned by some. The very fact that these were under question so long is proof that careful discrimination was made and that a book was received into the canon only when its genuineness was fully established by careful investigation of the facts. It was during this period that many eminent Christian writers wrote their catalogs of the New Testament books. As to their canonicity, the books were of two classes—those known as "homologumena" (i. e., acknowledged), and those called "antilegomena" (or disputed). Twenty of the twenty-seven books were in the first class. The remaining seven were the disputed books and included Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation. However, the question was not so much whether or not they are canonical, but whether they were written by their reputed authors. James and Jude styled themselves "servants," instead of calling themselves "apostles." John called himself an elder. Some of the earliest catalogs admitted books as canonical that later writers questioned. The very variation in these lists and the final acceptance of all the books as canonical is proof of the great care and intelligent discrimination used in the determining of the canon.

Careful discrimination as to canonical writings was desirable to the early Christians for various reasons. First, these documents were greatly revered and read in the churches as inspired scripture. This was common in the second century, according to Justin Martyr and Tertullian. Because of their great reverence for the writings of the apostles, they were careful to exclude spurious and apocryphal documents. And, too, heretics were ready to forge writings in the name of apostles to support their erroneous teachings, which was another reason for carefulness. Again, as in Diocletian's persecution, Christians were often called upon to give their lives in defense of their sacred scriptures. When life and death were at issue, they discriminated carefully against apocryphal documents. Considering the high regard then held for the apostles' writings, the strong motives for the most careful discrimination by early Christians, and that the investigation was conducted over a long period by many of the most learned men of the time, including philosophers, rhetoricians, and divines, we may be assured that the books were finally accepted only on the most certain grounds

of their genuineness. Again the proof is more than is needed. Apologetics requires only the proof of the genuineness of those books recording the miracles of Jesus and the apostles, namely the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles; and we have the proof, not only of these, but of all the other books of the New Testament also.

4. **Early Adversaries Never Denied Genuineness.**—If it be objected that the authorities cited for the genuineness of the New Testament are all friends of Christianity, it may be answered that the testimony of a Christian ought to be regarded as being at least equally credible with that of a heathen. However, among all the formidable enemies of ancient times none are known to have ever once questioned the genuineness of the New Testament. They make attacks on the books seeking internal flaws and endeavoring to show contradictions, but never do they dispute their genuineness.

Porphyry, who wrote about the year 270 A. D., was the most deadly foe early Christianity had. He had every advantage of learning, ability, and position to discover any ungenuineness in the Christians' Scriptures. He shows by his writings against them that he knew the value of such an argument; but he makes no attempt to prove them ungenuine, although it is certain he was acquainted with them. Doubtless his refraining from such an attempt was because he knew evidence existed that they were genuine. Celsus was another noted adversary of Christianity, who flourished 176 A. D., or less than eighty years after the death of the apostle John. He was a learned man, well acquainted with the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John and several of the Epistles, from which he quotes not less than eighty times. Living so near the time of their writing, he had full opportunity to prove them ungenuine if such were possible; but that it was not possible is evident from his entire silence on the subject. This acceptance of the genuineness of the New Testament at so early a date by men of learning who were its invetcrate foes and desired to disprove it, is a most convincing proof of New Testament authorship that can not be disputed.

A further confirmation of the genuineness of the New Testament is the nature of the language in which it is written, which corresponds to the time and circumstances of the writing and also with the characters and degree of culture of the writers.

II. Integrity of the New Testament

After showing the genuineness of the New Testament, the next point for inquiry is its integrity. How do we know that its text has not become corrupted by the much copying of it during the centuries so that the sense of the original writings is lost? Can the original manuscripts of the inspired penmen be produced? That they are not known to exist is certain, and that they will yet be found is not probable. But here also God has not left his Word without many witnesses. From many sources, proofs of various kinds may be produced that our present New Testament text is practically that of the apostolic period.

1. **Evidence from Ancient Manuscripts.**—The manuscripts of the New Testament now extant are very numerous. Scholars consider that as many as twenty manuscripts of an ancient classic are sufficient to determine its original text. But the manuscripts of the Bible collected by scholars for the determining of its original reading are actually counted by the thousands, twenty-six hundred having been collected for editing critical editions of the text, in the original languages. Certainly these are enough to establish the correct reading of the sacred text. Some of these date back but a few hundred years before the oldest printed Bible, which was produced in the middle of the fifteenth century. But some date back to as early as the eighth century, and a few to the fourth. Ordinarily the older a manuscript the greater its value; but a comparatively late manuscript may have great value if it is shown to have been copied from a very ancient manuscript. That none date farther back than the fourth century may be due to the destruction of many copies during the Diocletian persecution in 302. Three of the most valued manuscripts are the Sinaitic, in the Petrograd Library, in Russia; the Vatican Manuscript, in the Vatican, at Rome; and the Alexandrian Manuscript, in the British Museum. All of these are said to date back to the fourth century. These, especially as corroborated by hundreds of other manuscripts, have much value for verifying our text today.

But it may be objected that in these many ancient manuscripts of the New Testament there are literally thousands of different readings. This is true, but alarm is needless; for it is also true that these are very minor variations in nearly all cases, unintentional errors of copyists such as omissions or trans-

positions in letters or the substitution of words of similar meaning, and that not one in a thousand makes any real difference in the meaning of the text. And in all these no doctrine, duty, or fact is affected. By a careful comparison of these manuscripts by scholars, the sacred text has been purified to such an extent that it may be safely said we are certain of nine hundred and ninty-nine words of every thousand.

2. **Corroboration of Ancient Versions and Quotations.**—The propagation of Christianity in lands where the Greek language, in which the New Testament was originally written, was not commonly known required the translation of the New Testament into these languages. Some of these translations were made at a very early date. Probably the oldest is the Syriac, or Peshito, which was made into the Aramaic for the use of the Syrian churches as early as the second century—according to some of the best Syriac scholars, some parts were made before the close of the first century. Though it was not brought into contact with our Greek New Testament until the sixteenth century, having been in the hands of the Eastern churches, yet when compared with the Greek text it was found to be practically identical with it in its reading. This is a remarkable confirmation of the integrity of our New Testament text, and shows certainly that it is now such as it was in the second century,when the Syriac Version was made. The Old Latin Version was translated in North Africa about 170 A. D., for the Latin-speaking churches. It was revised by Jerome in making the Vulgate (383-404), which has ever since been the standard of the Roman Catholic Church. The agreement between this and the Greek text shows the latter to be practically the same as that of the second century. The Peshito contains all the books of the Bible except 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation. The Old Latin omits only Hebrews, James, and 2 Peter. The two together prove the existence of all the books of the New Testament except 2 Peter as early as the second century, and that they were substantially the same as we now have them. Several other versions also have much value in proving the uncorruptness of the sacred text. Among them are the Septuagint of the Old Testament, translated 250 B. C.; the Coptic, or Egyptian, 200 A. D.; the Gothic, fourth century; Ethiopic, 400 A. D.; the Armenian,

fifth century; the Slavonian, ninth century; and the Arabic, tenth century.

And the uncorrupt preservation of the sacred text can be proved not only by comparison with ancient versions, but also by the many quotations to be found in the Christian writers of the first three centuries. Sir David Dalrymple found the entire New Testament was quoted by them with the exception of eleven verses. How marvelously has God preserved to us many infallible proofs of the integrity of the text of the New Testament!

3. **No Material Change Was Possible.**—That a corruption of the sacred writings did not occur has been sufficiently shown. But why it could not have occurred is also evident. As soon as the sacred books were published, copies began to be made so that in a short time they were scattered over the entire civilized world. These were revered as divinely inspired scripture and read privately and in the churches. They were carefully and jealously guarded against any important change in their text or meaning. To suppose that any overcredulous person could have interpolated in the sacred text legendary stories of miracles is preposterous. First, it would have been necessary to change the copies throughout the world, which could not have been done, and if it had been done it could not have been kept secret from skeptics. Also, Christianity had too many enemies for such a thing to occur without its being detected. Enemies would not allow friends to change the text, and friends were very careful that heretics or enemies did not change it; besides, neither could have changed the text even though not thus watched by the other. Because it carries its proof with it, the method God has chosen for the preservation of the integrity of the sacred text is better than if the original manuscripts had been preserved, unless they were unquestionably proved to be the autographs of the inspired writers.

III. Credibility of the New Testament History

How do we know that the history related in the New Testament, especially in the Gospels, is worthy of being believed? The proof of the genuineness and uncorrupt transmission of the text of the New Testament would ordinarily be assumed to imply its credibility, but it is conceivable that a history may be genuine and yet not true to facts. In the evidences of Christianity, nothing need be left to assumption. Every link required for the

argument may be and should be supplied. Here, as on other points, the evidence is of overwhelming strength, though space permits but a brief statement of it. Our purpose at this point is not to attempt at once to show the New Testament to be a divine revelation, but to show only that its history as such is true.

1. **Credibility of the Gospel History Accepted by Those Familiar with the Events.**—The surest proof that the miracles and other events of the gospel history are worthy of belief is the fact that they were believed and propagated by multitudes, at the peril of their lives, who lived at the time and places where the events are alleged to have occurred. We have certain proof that the Gospels were published as we now have them in the very land where their events occurred and during the lifetime of the people who witnessed the things described. Had they been published in a part of the world so far from the scene of the events that no one could have investigated or testified as to their truthfulness, or if they had not been published until more than a century after the events so that no one living could have confirmed the statements as an actual witness, then the proof had been less positive. But the writer of the first Gospel testifies as an eye-witness of the events described. He wrote his Gospel to the Jews among whom the events of Jesus' ministry took place. He wrote and published it in the land of Palestine, where Jesus spent his life. He wrote and published it while the majority of those were still living who lived when the events occurred and who witnessed their occurrence.

Surely if he had seriously misstated the truth about any important fact mentioned it could not have passed unchallenged in that age of culture and religious controversy. If critical scribes, Pharisees, and Sadducees sought so diligently to catch Jesus in his words, it is certain they would be ready to deny any false statement as to known facts at that later period when so many of their disciples had fallen away to the new faith of Christ. The entire gospel history reflects severely on the Jews as a whole, and especially on their rulers and priests. Why did they not deny the statement of Matthew that Jesus opened the eyes of two blind men at Jericho on the occasion of his last journey to Jerusalem? Or why did they not deny the statement that darkness was over all the land for three hours at Christ's death on the cross? Why did they not contradict that statement of Luke

that a lame man was healed at the temple gate by Peter?

That neither Jew nor Greek in all their opposition to Christianity in the first century ever attempted to deny the truthfulness of the gospel writers is a silent testimony by all the thousands of those enemies of Christianity, who knew that the events described actually occurred. If these things could have been denied successfully, those were not wanting who would most certainly have denied them. Their silence is proof that they knew the events related concerning Jesus were so notorious that to deny them would have made themselves ridiculous. They attributed Jesus' miracles to the power of Beelzebub, but never denied their occurrence.

Also, those thousands of Christians of that period who in the face of persecution, imprisonment, and death itself affirmed their belief of these things had abundant opportunity for investigation, and many of them had been eye-witnesses of the events described. Do men choose to suffer dishonor, privation, persecution, and violent deaths in defense of what they know to be false? If not, then these men knew the things they taught to be true and could not doubt them. Their affirmation of these things under such circumstances is reason enough for our believing them.

2. **The Writers Possessed the Requisites for Credibility.**—Two qualifications are necessary to constitute one a credible witness: one must have adequate knowledge and dependable honesty. In the nature of the case, the testimony of one possessing these qualifications must be true. Did the gospel writers possess them?

That they had full opportunity to know the facts concerning the events they relate is certain. Matthew and John were with Jesus throughout his ministry. They lived with him, learned at his feet, and witnessed his miracles in broad daylight; not once, but hundreds of times over a period of years. They were among his most intimate friends. They could not have been deceived. No mere sleight-of-hand tricks could have passed undetected when put to such tests as were these miracles. It is not possible that these men, whose writings show them to be men of well-balanced minds, could have been so carried away by enthusiasm that they would have imagined, in many details as to persons, time, place, and other circumstances, such a long series of events to have occurred that never actually occurred. The theory that

they were so influenced by enthusiasm that they unconsciously misrepresented the truth to the extent of all the supernatural in the New Testament history is untenable when applied to the particular events and miracles recorded.

That the New Testament writers possessed trustworthy honesty as historians is evident from their writings. They do not write as men conscious of intention to deceive. Writers of fictitious stories do not mention the time, place, and other circumstances relating to an alleged event so that it can be investigated. But these writers of the gospel and apostolic histories commonly tell the time and place of a miracle, and even the name of the persons concerned. "Generality is the cloak of fiction." But John tells of a man named Lazarus of Bethany whose sisters were named Mary and Martha, and that Lazarus died there, was buried for four days, and that in the presence of several witnesses besides the disciples, Jesus called him out of the tomb alive. Deceivers do not write such details. Also in political events, which they often mention in detail, they can be proved to be correct, and their honesty in recording these facts is reason for believing they have as honestly recorded other things.

But the most convincing proof that they were honest in their writings is the fact that they were willing to suffer disgrace, persecution, and even death in defense of what they wrote. They could have had no motive for deception. If they intended to deceive, they were evil men. Then their motive must have been for selfish advantage. But instead of gain, these men had a prospect only of loss, even of life. When they were offered the choice between recantation and death, they all without hesitation chose death. Surely rather than to suppose such things it is easier to believe they were honest and were firmly convinced of what they wrote.

IV. Miracles

Jesus and his apostles came proclaiming that they were divinely sent messengers commissioned to impart to mankind a revelation of the way of salvation. As credentials that they were ambassadors of God, they pointed to certain works which are described as being miracles. The necessity for credentials of some kind to substantiate a claim to being an ambassador of God is at once apparent. Jesus recognized the propriety of men's requiring of him such proofs of his claims. He appealed

to his works as credentials when the Jews said, "What sign showest thou then, that we may see, and believe thee? what dost thou work?" And when another asked if he was the promised Messiah, he said, "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up."

Nothing can be better proof that one is a messenger sent of God than power to perform miracles. The power the messenger exercises which is superior to that of nature is at once properly assumed to be the power of Him who constituted nature. And one very naturally concludes as did Nicodemus when he said, "We know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." Even prominent infidels have admitted such credentials are acceptable. They question only whether it can be shown that miracles have actually occurred. The New Testament writers not only affirm that miracles were worked, but they describe them in minute detail. The proof already given of the genuineness of the New Testament and of the credibility of the writers of it ought to be sufficient reason for accepting the plain accounts of miracles therein given as sure evidence that Christianity and the Scriptures are of God. The evidence is complete at this point, and the investigator might properly be referred at once to the Sacred Writings. However, that the real strength of the evidences may be shown it is well that we give further proof of the reality of the miracles described in the New Testament. This we might proceed to do at once except for certain antecedent objections to miracles that skeptics have raised. These must first be answered.

1. **Possibility and Probability of Miracles.**—A miracle has been defined by G. P. Fisher as "an event which the forces of nature —including the natural powers of man—can not of themselves produce, and which must, therefore, be referred to a supernatural agency." A fuller definition might be given, but this expresses the main characteristics. A miracle is not necessarily a violation nor a contradiction of natural law. Neither does it involve a suspension of natural law, but only the entrance of another power that operates independently of nature. The power of gravitation was no more suspended when Jesus walked on the water than it is when a boy throws a ball into the air.

The ordinary necessitated powers of nature are merely transcended. It is not an event without a cause, but one caused by God's supernatural operation. Attempts have been made to show on scientific grounds that miracles are impossible. It is said that the laws of nature are uniform, that a miracle is a violation of nature's laws and therefore it can not occur. In reply it may be said that this objection has the serious fault of begging the question. As just stated, a miracle is not necessarily either a violation or a contradiction of natural law. The principal weakness of the objection is that it ignores the fact that an event in nature may be caused by an agent acting in nature yet above nature. The human will, through its physical organism, is capable of acting on and independently of the necessitated powers of nature. Man is able to hold an iron ax at the surface of a body of water, although gravitation would naturally cause it to sink to the bottom. If man can do such a thing, surely the Almighty can do so (2 Kings 6:5-7). If we admit the existence of a personal extra-mundane God, the denial of the possibility of miracles is ridiculous. Only those question the possibility of miracles who hold a pantheistic, or any other than a theistic, conception of God.

Many volumes have been written concerning the probability of miracles. Skeptics have endeavored to show an antecedent improbability of the occurrence of miracles. But all that has been said on the probability of revelation has a bearing here. From man's great need of a divine revelation and God's goodness, it is reasoned that a revelation is probable. And from the necessity of authentication of that revelation and the special value and appropriateness of miracles as authentication it is reasoned that miracles are probable. It is evident from the existence of moral law and moral beings that nature does not exist for its own sake, but for the use of moral beings. Also, it is reasonable to expect God to work miracles independently of natural law when he sees it is advantageous for man's moral excellence. The sinfulness and depravity of men have resulted in the creation of a need of such supernatural manifestations as a means to their recovery. Therefore the presumption is in favor of the occurrence of miracles.

2. **Possibility of Proving Miracles by Testimony.**—It is not uncommonly affirmed by skeptics that even if the possibility and

probability of miracles, or even their actual occurrence, be admitted, yet their occurrence can not be proved by testimony, nor known to any except those who actually witnessed them. Their argument as stated by Hume, whose name is usually connected with this objection, is briefly as follows: Because a miracle is so contradictory to all human experience, it is more reasonable to believe any amount of testimony is false than it is to believe a miracle has actually occurred. This is the great labor-saving device of infidels in their opposition to miracles. Any attempt by skeptics honestly to meet and disprove the vast amount of evidences of the occurrence of miracles would require much learned labor, and then they could not hope to give a convincing refutation. But by this simple formula of Hume's, which the most ignorant skeptic can memorize and recite, it is supposed that at a single sweep all the Christian evidences from the many accounts of miracles are disposed of at once and forever.

But the argument is unsound for more than one reason. The principal fallacy of it is, however, that it makes one's own personal experience the measure of all human experience. If this were true, no new or unusual event or fact could be learned except by the senses. The truth is that most of the things we know we learn through testimony. Unless we did credit the testimony of others, none could believe such an event as a volcanic eruption or a severe earthquake ever occurred except the comparatively small number who have been witnesses of them. Or except for belief in testimony to an unusual but possible event, the person whose life has been spent in the torrid zone must deny the fact that water congeals and becomes ice at a temperature of 32 degrees Fahrenheit. Or if it is more reasonable to believe any amount of testimony false rather than to believe an event true that is beyond the realm of our own personal experience, then the majority of men must forever remain ignorant of most of the facts they now know. They can not know that great geysers exist. The size of the earth, the depth of the ocean, the height of the highest mountain-peaks, the fact of the radiophone, and of wireless telegraphy can never be known except by those who demonstrate or see them.

To exclude testimony and make experience the only ground for confidence is to require the rejection of all that does not agree with what we have personally witnessed. It means to re-

ject most of what we know and to close the door of our minds to all beyond the narrow limits of our personal observation. It is neither proper nor the custom of sound-thinking men to hold such an attitude toward testimony. He who should attempt to hold such an attitude in all the affairs of life would be regarded as immoderately skeptical indeed. Men accept or reject testimony concerning unusual but possible events, not because it accords with nor contradicts their experience, but according to the credibility or incredibility of the witness.

If a party of twenty-five eminent scientists exploring a newly discovered land should return with the astonishing report that they found mountains there consisting of solid gold, the question would not be, Does this agree with or contradict our experience? but, Is their testimony credible? If they are all trained mineralogists capable of determining what is gold and what is not, and if they all ever in the past have proved themselves to be truthful men, then their testimony should not and would not be rejected as insufficient ground for believing those mountains of gold exist.

Or if ten men known to be intelligent and truthful tell of seeing a certain man dead and buried in the tomb, we believe their testimony without difficulty. Then if they further tell us that they saw him raised from the dead by an adequate cause, the power of God, for the purpose of authenticating a revelation of God to men of the way of salvation, which is certainly adequate purpose, there is no reason why their testimony should not be accepted as is their testimony of the man's death and burial.

Hume's argument against miracles is also chargeable with the fallacy of self-contradiction. It endeavors to overthrow our faith in human testimony by opposing to such testimony the general experience of men. But how can we know what is the experience of men generally except by their testimony? Or how can we know we have disproved the credibility of human testimony if we must credit it in order to discredit it!

3. **Proofs that Miracles Occurred.**—Now we come to the vital question. Did miracles actually occur in the ministry of Jesus and his apostles? It is not a matter of theory, but a plain question of fact. If they occurred, in the nature of them their reality was discernible by the senses. The raising of Lazarus from the dead, the feeding of the multitudes with five loaves and two

fishes, the opening of the blind eyes of Bartimæus, or the curing of the lame man at the gate Beautiful could be brought to the test of the senses. And like other historic events, a credible record of them could be transmitted to those of later ages. In addition, then, to the general credibility of the gospel history already shown, and which ought to be sufficient, what other reasons do we have for believing that miracles were actually performed?

(1) *They were done publicly.* The Bible miracles were not done in a corner, but for the greater part in the most public manner possible and before many witnesses, including not only those sympathetic towards Christ, but also those opposed. They were not done in the absence of witnesses, as were the supernatural things related of Mohammed such as the night visits of the angel Gabriel to him, and the transmission to him from heaven of the various parcels of the Koran from time to time. They were performed before the multitude in the crowded temple courts, before the people gathered in the synagogs, along the public highway thronged with pilgrims to the Passover, and before the assembled thousands who came with their sick and diseased for healing and to sit at his feet to hear his word. Persons of all classes witnessed them—the rich and the poor; the learned scribe and Pharisee, and the common fisherman and farmer; rulers of broad experience like Nicodemus; and Roman military men such as the centurion of Capernaum. They were done, not alone in the quietude of Galilean villages, but at the great annual festivals at Jerusalem.

(2) *They were of great number and variety.* Another proof of the reality of the Bible miracles is the great number of them. Imposters pretending to miracles usually find it less difficult to pretend to but few. But the ministry of Jesus as described in the Gospels was filled with them. Not fewer than forty are described in detail, and these are represented as only examples of very many others which he did. These miracles were also of great variety; so they could not have been sleight-of-hand tricks. He cured all kinds of diseases, not of a few selected persons, but of all who came to him. And not only did he cure the sick, but he raised the dead on at least three occasions. Twice he fed the multitudes with a very small quantity of food. He turned water

into wine. And he stilled the storm. Only Omnipotence is capable of these things.

(3) *They were performed over a long period of time.* Throughout the three years of Jesus' personal ministry and for many years after during the ministry of the apostles, these marvelous works continued. They could have been examined again and again. Persons healed or raised from the dead continued to live in the localities where the miracles were performed; so it could be known that the works were genuine and permanent. Any skeptic in that day had ample time to go to see and test the miracles for himself.

(4) *They were performed by unlearned men.* The performers of the New Testament miracles were for the most part not men of the schools, not educated, nor of high social standing or wealth. They were not capable, merely as men, to carry out a scheme of imposture that would not have been detected by their numerous enemies in that enlightened age.

(5) *No attempt to perform them failed.* In no instance did Jesus and his apostles fail in any attempt to heal all the vast multitudes who applied to them. It is true that the disciples once failed to heal a demoniac boy; but Jesus instantly healed him, and told them the cause of their failure. According to the records, their cures were always definite and complete. No scheme of fraud could thus always succeed so perfectly. Only the power of God sufficiently accounts for these results.

(6) *They were examined, but never denied.* These miracles were carefully examined at the time they were performed and for many years following. Many open-minded persons, like Nicodemus, examined them and believed Jesus' claims as a consequence. But they were most critically examined by the enemies of Christ, who were many. The claims of Christianity were such that it was at once opposed by both the state and all other religions. Judaism and Paganism, led by their powerful priesthoods, alike sought to destroy it. It was opposed by learned scribes and powerful rulers. Had it been possible to swear these miracles were frauds, these enemies would certainly have so sworn. The chief priests would have had no need to stain their hands with the blood of Jesus if they could have shown his miracles were not genuine. They were compelled to acknowledge their reality even if they did falsely ascribe them to the power

of Satan. Right in the presence of their enemies in times of severe persecution and opposition Jesus and his apostles appealed to their miracles as proof that they were of God. Peter did so in his Pentecostal sermon, also when brought before the Sanhedrin after the healing of the lame man. If these enemies of Christianity could have denied the reality of those miracles, they would have done so. But never once did they attempt it. To have tried to do so would have shown their own hypocrisy and made them ridiculous in the eyes of all men.

(7) *They were acknowledged by friends.* Most of the friends of Christianity were such because they believed these miracles real. They knew in many instances that to accept Christianity meant disgrace, poverty, persecution, and death, and if they had found fraud in these alleged miracles they would never have chosen to accept Christ. But it was because they knew that his miracles were real that they recognized him as a teacher come from God and worthy of their homage. Neither do we have record of any of them confessing they were deceived in supposing these miracles were real. They sometimes as a result of persecution forsook Christianity, but none is known ever to have confessed he was mistaken about the reality of Jesus' miracles. As converts these would have had opportunity to know whatever secrets may have belonged to the working of the New Testament miracles. If there was any machinery for fraud, they would have been aware of it. But never once do we have record of any who had departed from the faith ever pretending to reveal any secrets or disclose any fraud in Jesus' miracles. Judas Iscariot was one of Jesus' disciples, a preacher, and had been sent himself by Jesus to perform miracles. When he sold his master, why did he not expose any fraud in Jesus' miracles? He would have been paid well for doing so. Why did he not give his testimony against Jesus at his trial? The answer is certain. "I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood." Here is a wonderful testimony to the genuineness of the miracles of Jesus.

(8) *They were acknowledged by enemies.* The enemies of the gospel had abundant opportunity to test the miracles of Jesus as to their genuineness, and strong reason for doing so; and it is certain they did examine them. But they never once denied the reality of the miracles, and their failure to deny the

reality of them is a strong testimony to their genuineness. We could hardly ask that these enemies expose their own hypocrisy by giving positive testimony to the miracles of the gospel. Yet they have not only united in witnessing to these miracles by their silence as to any attempt at denying them, but they have given positive testimony to their genuineness. Since the credibility of the gospel history has been shown, we might quote from that the words of enemies to show that they acknowledged the reality of these miracles; but to make the testimony stronger, proof is adduced from other sources. The Jewish writers in the Talmud acknowledge these miracles as having really occurred, but refer them to magic or other sources than the will and power of God. Even heathen writers admit the reality of the gospel miracles. Celsus acknowledged that Christ wrought miracles by which people were caused to believe he is the Messiah. He also ascribes them to magic. Also Porphyry, Lucian, Hierocles, and Julian, the emperor, admit that miracles were performed, but Julian attempts to make light of them, wondering why so much stir should be made about a person who merely "opened the eyes of the blind, restored limbs to the lame, and delivered persons possessed."

(9) *Christ's claims were based on his miracles from the beginning.* The religion of the Bible is the only world religion which at its beginning appealed to miracles as evidence of the divine authority of its teachers. It is true that most false religions claim miracles for their founders; but these miracles were appendages of religions already set up, and were not the evidence by which the authority of the religions were first established. Moreover, such miracles, like those of Mohammed, were witnessed by no one except the performer of them. They were done in a corner, and consequently have no evidential value, as do the miracles of the Bible. No other religion ever made such bold claims as did that of the Bible in pointing to its miracles as its credentials at a time when it had no sympathetic followers. Had its miracles not been what they were professed to be, it would never have been accepted by the millions who became its adherents in the early centuries.

What incredulity must be necessary on the part of modern infidels to deny the reality of the gospel miracles, supported as they are by all the foregoing considerations! Belief in these

miracles is reasonable. Denial of their reality is unreasonable. To suppose they did not occur, reason requires belief in the still more remarkable and unaccountable miracle—that those who witnessed them should have universally been led to suppose them genuine.

The foregoing facts leave no room for any of those modern rationalistic theories which would explain the entire gospel history on natural grounds. The theory of Paulus that the records of miracles are "honest but uncritical interpretations of natural events" has already been sufficiently disproved. This theory attempts to support the honesty of the writers of the Gospels, but it certainly reflects severely on the integrity of Jesus in the light of those texts in which he testifies of his own miracles, as in the message he sent back by John the Baptist's messengers (Luke 7:22). The mythical theory of Strauss assumes that as a result of the prevailing Messianic ideas of the Jews that miracles would be worked by the Messiah when he came, the people unconsciously objectified those ideas which took on the form of miraculous history. But in objection it may well be asked, If Christ did not work such miracles, how did he succeed in convincing the people of his Messiahship? The rationalistic theory of Renan makes Jesus an unwilling yet an intentional deceiver. This theory supposes that Jesus played the part of deception in merely pretending to work miracles in response to the unwelcome but popular demand for them. It would tell us that Jesus, who unsparingly denounced hypocrites, was himself constantly engaged in practicing hypocrisy; that he who imparted the loftiest ethical teaching men have ever known, constantly pretended what he knew was false; that that most spotless of all lives was one long strain of deception. Such are the extremes to which those must go who would deny the miraculous elements of the Gospel history. These rationalistic theories are unscientific both in their methods and in their conclusions. Only those who are unwilling to believe in the supernatural could be appealed to by theories so unsound.

4. **Proof of the Resurrection of Christ.**—Another method of proving the genuineness of Gospel miracles is to examine the evidence of particular miracles. By this means we may determine whether the original witnesses had competent knowledge to judge the alleged miraculous occurrences. The greatest of all the

miracles is the bodily resurrection of Christ from the dead. All others can easily be believed if this can be shown to have occurred. Also, as the apostles affirmed, it is fundamental to Christianity. With the credibility of the Gospel history established, we may properly appeal to the facts concerning the resurrection there presented. Then what are the facts? Friends and enemies alike admit the following:

The resurrection of Christ was predicted in the Old Testament by David, and was often foretold by Jesus himself. He was crucified on a cross, and after six hours he died there. Later the executioners, recognizing he was dead, did not break his legs to hasten death as they did the legs of those who were crucified with him. But to make sure of his death, one of them ran a spear into his side, which would have caused death had it not already occurred. A still further proof that Jesus actually died is that he was officially pronounced dead by the centurion in answer to Pilate's inquiry. He was placed in the tomb, where he lay for about thirty-six hours. At the end of that time his body was missing from the tomb in spite of the fact that the guard was there to keep the disciples honest and the seal was on the door to keep the guard honest.

Now, the body could have been removed only by enemies, his friends, or himself. Who did it? If his enemies did it, they could have had no other motive than to exhibit the body in disproof of any claims of its resurrection. But though the apostles boldly affirmed Christ's resurrection before the assembled multitudes in Jerusalem and before the Sanhedrin itself, the enemies of Christ never produced his body, which they would surely have done if it were in their possession. Though his friends were accused of stealing the body, the charge was so unreasonable that Matthew, who relates it, rightly considers it needs no refutation. They lacked the courage necessary for so daring an act. It was the time of full moon, and Jerusalem and its environs were crowded with Passover pilgrims, and such a theft would certainly have been detected by the soldiers or others. That several soldiers on guard-duty should all have fallen asleep at the same time in the open air is altogether improbable, especially when they knew the penalty was death for such an offense. Too, if they had done so they would not voluntarily have confessed it. Moreover, how could they truthfully testify to that which they said occurred

while they were asleep? And again, if the disciples of Jesus had actually stolen the body, the guard would have always reproached them with it! but we have no record of any such thing. Still further, it is certain the disciples were entirely too honest thus to deceive. Men who uphold the high ethical standards which they taught and willingly die in defense of their teaching can not be deceivers. Then the body of Jesus must have been removed by Jesus himself, as he had foretold.

But the most certain evidence of his resurrection is the different appearances of Jesus to his disciples in his resurrected body, after his death. Twelve times, by many witnesses, he was seen alive after his burial. These witnesses talked with him, ate with him, and handled him. They even saw in his hands and feet the prints of the nails by which he was fastened to the cross. These appearances continued over a period of forty days. Luke rightly calls these "infallible proofs." These appearances were witnessed by a number of persons in most instances, and at one time by more than five hundred persons. These experiences of the disciples could not have been the result of hallucination or the product of imagination and enthusiasm. If they could have, they would have continued and increased constantly as a result of the emotional excitement from which they originated. But at the end of forty days they suddenly stopped. They can not be accounted for on the ground of imposition, because the disciples were not only too honest, but also too unlearned successfully to practise it. Neither can the disciples properly be charged with being unduly credulous. Instead, they were "slow to believe." Yet the resurrection of their Master was so certain to them that the belief of it gave them a remarkable degree of boldness, which enabled them to proclaim this great truth everywhere. The unwavering faith the apostles had in the resurrection of Christ is such that F. C. Baur, the ablest representative of the skeptical critics, confesses that no explanation can be given for it. "There is only one explanation—namely, that the fact occurred."

5. **Evidential Value of Miracles.**—The purpose of the Scripture miracles is to attest the doctrines taught there as being true. They are not, however, direct evidence of the truth of those doctrines, else a new miracle must have been given in proof of each new doctrine taught. They indirectly attested the mes-

sage taught by certifying to the divine authority of the religious teacher who worked them and delivered the message. But miracles alone do not prove a man to be a divinely commissioned teacher. He must not only work miracles, but they must be accompanied with purity of life and doctrine. If he certainly teaches contrary to previously well-attested revelations, or if his manner of life is contradictory to them, he can not be of God whatever may be his works.

(1) *Counterfeit miracles.* These consist in supernatural or wonderful events attributable to evil spirits or by men through natural means beyond our knowledge. They are not miracles in the truest sense. They include all supernatural events accomplished through spiritualism or sorcery. Examples of them are whatever supernatural works may have been done by the Egyptian magicians who withstood Moses, those of Simon the sorcerer at Samaria, or those cures and other supernatural events which accompany modern spiritualism. It is not unreasonable nor unbiblical that demon spirits should do extraordinary works for the purpose of better deceiving men. Under the heading of counterfeit miracles may also be classed the spurious miracles imputed to Jesus in the apocryphal writings, and evidently at least some of the medieval miracles so called.

These counterfeit miracles may be distinguished from the genuine in various ways. If, as in the case of modern spiritualism, they are performed by persons of immoral conduct, or are contradictory in teaching to truth already revealed, they are not proof that such persons are divinely commissioned. Also, true miracles have a sufficient purpose which they are designed to accomplish. Again, they must be of a degree of dignity becoming to the divine working, and have sufficient substantiating evidence.

(2) *Modern miracles.* Though it is true that the greatest manifestations of miracles have taken place at those periods when special revelations of truth needed to be attested, as at the times of Moses, the prophets, and Christ, yet this does not exclude divine miraculous working at all times as a matter of benevolence, or for the purpose of further certifying to men of that place and age God's existence or revelation already given. It is according to Scripture and the experience of the best Christians in all ages that God answers prayer; and not only that he

answers, but that some of those answers are supernatural and miraculous in their nature. Modern miracles are becoming more common continually, especially in the supernatural healing of the sick through prayer and faith. Doubtless miracles have occurred to a greater or less extent all through the centuries, among devout people.

One purpose of modern miracles may be to assist those in need of such help as is not possible by processes of nature. A second purpose is doubtless the direct manifestation of God's love and benevolence to draw out men's love for him. But doubtless another and important purpose is to give special direct proof of God's existence and to attest further the Scriptures as divine revelation. A modern miracle of the nature of an answer to prayer and faith in the specific promises of Scripture is a direct evidence of the divine authority of the Scriptures to those who have the proof of such miracles. Doubtless God has not left himself without such witness in all ages.

V. Prophecy

By prophecy as used in the present connection is not meant the making known of the will of God generally, but rather, more restrictedly, the predicting of future events. In this sense prophecy may be described as a foretelling of future events that can not be foreknown by human wisdom, but only by means of direct communication from God. The possibility of prophecy presents no difficulty if we allow that God is a person and is possesssed of infinite knowledge. As God may attest his messengers by manifesting his omnipotence through them in miracles, so likewise it is also antecedently probable that he should manifest his omniscience through them in predicting future events for the same purpose.

1. **Nature of the Argument from Fulfilled Prophecy.**—The future is hidden from our view as by a thick veil hanging immediately before each of us. We can not know certainly by any human wisdom what tomorrow will bring forth. We may reason from existing causes or past experience that certain events are probable, but in such reasonings the element of uncertainty must be given a place. We may predict that a man in good health will die and be fairly sure that our prediction will not fail; but if we attempt the prediction that a particular person will die

at noon ten years from the first day of the present month at a particular point of latitude and longitude in the ocean, where he will drown as a result of falling from an airplane, and add to these particulars the place of his residence at that time, and the nature of his vocation—who will say there is the least possibility of the prediction being fulfilled? There is not one chance in a million that it will come to pass. It is such minute particulars, as well as their exalted purpose, their great number and variety, and the length of time they cover, that place the Bible prophecies infinitely above all human guesses.

Only to God and to those to whom he reveals them can future events be certainly known. The Scripture-writers, claiming to be divinely sent messengers, predicted, in many details, events which came to pass centuries later. Therefore the messages of such men are proved to be of God; for it is certain divine aid would not be given for the advancement of deception or fraud. Prophecy is a species of miracle, being a manifestation of divine knowledge as other miracles are manifestations of divine power. It has no evidential value until fulfilled; but when it is fulfilled it has weight fully as great as that of miracles in attestation of revelation. Though in its nature it is no more conclusive as Christian evidence than are miracles, yet to most men, especially those not trained to judge the value of evidence, the proof from prophecy is far more impressive. The proof from prophecy is not dependent upon ancient testimony and the genuineness and credibility of the historical writings transmitting such testimony to us, but is before our eyes in the present-day fulfilment of various predictions of Scripture. Another important consideration concerning the argument from prophecy is that it grows continually stronger during the years with every new fulfilment.

No attestation can be more certain proof of the divine authority of the Scriptures than the fulfilment of their prophecy. A fair evaluation of them as evidence excludes the idea of fraud. They are too far-reaching as to time to be anything but true. They began to be uttered in Eden immediately after man's fall into sin, and are continued throughout Bible history. Their fulfilment began to be accomplished hundreds of years before the time of Christ, and they are still being fulfilled at the present day. They reach from Eden to the end of the world. They are

also very many in number, and of great variety. They predict concerning individuals and nations, Israel and heathen peoples, the Jews and the Gentiles, the kingdom of God and false religions; but they all have a connection with the great theme of the Bible—Christ and salvation through him. Many of them have already been fulfilled. Some are yet to be fulfilled because the time has not yet come. But others will never be fulfilled, because their fulfilment was made dependent upon conditions which were never met by the persons concerned. None can be shown ever to have failed.

Evidential value of prophecy requires that it shall have been given a long time before the happening of the event predicted. Many of the Scripture predictions possess this requisite, but others do not. An example of the latter is Jesus' prediction that when two of his disciples should go into the near-by village they would "find an ass tied, and a colt with her" (Matt. 21:2, 3). Here the fulfilment immediately followed the prediction, and the event was history when written. However, to those who heard the prediction and later experienced the event it had value as evidence of Jesus' superhuman knowledge, and on the strength of their testimony it has value for us the same as do miracles of that period.

Another requisite in prophecy for evidential value is that nothing must exist to make probable the event to merely human prescience. If Jesus' prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans had been given at an advanced stage of the siege, it could have had but little value as evidence; but having been spoken forty years before, in an age of universal peace, and given in many details, it has great value.

Another requirement is that it must not be ambiguous, nor yet be so clear as to secure its own fulfilment. Many of the Scripture prophecies, especially those about Christ, very remarkably meet this requirement. An example of this is the elaborate prediction concerning his suffering and death given in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. What it meant and how it was to be fulfilled was doubtless as difficult for those living before the time of Christ as it was for the Ethiopian eunuch who asked Philip to explain the passage to him. But to those acquainted with the New Testament history it is clear. A still further and last

requirement is that the prediction shall be fulfilled at the proper time.

2. **Objections to the Argument from Prophecy.**—Probably the most common objection to prophecy as Christian evidence is that the alleged prophecies are not prediction but history, and were written after the events occurred. But such an objection is either the result of inexcusable ignorance or else a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts. Many an uninformed skeptic will glibly state this objection, when if called upon to do so he could not make the semblance of a defense of his objection. It is intended as a labor-saving device for opposers of divine revelation who do not dare with manly argument to face the prophecies one by one and attempt to show they are not prophecy. A certain class of modern rationalists have attempted, under the guise of higher criticism of the Bible, to show a later date for certain prophetic books of the Bible. But allowing all their unproved statements to be true, still many of the most important evidences from prophecy remain in all their strength. In the later discussion of particular prophecies the historical proof of their prophetic nature will be shown.

A very common antecedent objection to prophecy is that all events are either necessary or contingent. If they are necessary events, it is said they are made necessary by present existing causes which will effect them, and consequently they may be foreseen and predicted by careful calculation from those causes by men without divine aid. If they are contingent, or dependent upon free choice, it is objected that they can not be foreknown either by God or men. If this objection were sound, no prophecy could have any value as evidence of divine attestation of a revelation. But the weakness of both points in the objection are not difficult to detect. The occurrence of most events is determined by previously existing causes, but those causes are often so hidden from men that knowledge of them is impossible, and consequently the effects can not possibly be known. A prediction of such events constitutes valid evidence of revelation. In reply to the second point in the objection, it is only necessary to say that foreknowledge is to be clearly distinguished from foreordination. Knowledge is not determinative of an event, but is determined by the event. The knowledge is according to the event that is to occur, but the event is not caused by the fore-

knowledge of it by either God or man. God being omniscient may foreknow contingent events, and by making them known through his messenger give evidence to all men that such messenger's message is from God.

A third objection is that many of the Scripture prophecies are so obscure that a critical thinker can not be certain he understands to what the prediction refers, and consequently can not know whether it has been fulfilled. In reply it may be said that there are many predictions which are clear and their meaning certain. It is to these that Christian apologists appeal. We need not concern ourselves here about the obscure prophecies; future history may make evident the meaning of some of them. It is unnecessary to our present purpose to show that a large proportion of the Scripture prophecies have been fulfilled. If it is clearly shown that a few of them are genuine predictions of events men could not possibly know, then those prove the Scriptures to be from God. A proper conception of the purpose of prophecy is helpful in accounting for the obscurity of some of it. It is not for the purpose of furnishing in detail a plan of the future. Neither is it intended to be profitable only as Christian evidence to those who live after its fulfilment. It is intended to benefit those who live before the occurrence of the events predicted by making known to them in broad general outline things to come, and in this way to encourage the hopeless and to warn the careless to be prepared for the future. Notable examples of this kind are the prophecies of Christ's first and second advent. Certainly many prophecies have value in this respect that are of no apologetical worth.

Another objection to prophecy as Christian evidence is that spiritualists through communication with demons are also able to predict future events. Allowing the truth of the objection, still, as with miracles from the same source, there is no need of confusing these with divinely given prophecies to the weakening of the latter as Christian evidence. The predictions of spiritualistic mediums are usually concerning things of very insignificant consequence in comparison with the Bible predictions. Also, they are very far below those of Scripture in the time spanned by them, their dignity, and purpose. And, too, they often fail of fulfilment, which would indicate they proceed from a finite being even though other than human. Moreover prophecy

does not stand alone as evidence, but must be corroborated by holy conduct and doctrine in harmony with that already divinely revealed. Spiritualistic mediums fail in these points.

The Bible prophecies may be classified as follows: Predictions (1) about the Jews, (2) about Gentile nations, (3) about Christ's first coming, (4) about the origin and history of God's kingdom, (5) about Christ's second advent. For obvious reasons the latter class has no evidential value. Space allows a consideration of but a few examples from the other classes.

3. **Predictions Concerning the Jews.**—Many prophecies are given in the Bible respecting the Jews, most of which have been wonderfully fulfilled. Attention might be directed to such as those relating to the Babylonish captivity and the return, or to Jesus' remarkable prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, which was very definitely fulfilled in many details forty years later. But that the skeptic may have no ground for any of the objections mentioned, especially that the account is history, and was written subsequently to the events described, attention is directed to predictions given at the beginning of Israelitish history which did not begin to be fulfilled until after the beginning of the Christian dispensation, and in some important particulars are being fulfilled at the present time.

In the twenty-eighth of Deuteronomy is given a detailed prediction of the punishments that should come upon the Jews if they should violate the covenant with God which they had solemnly agreed to keep. The minuteness of the description of these judgments shows them to be prophecy, not a mere apprehension of calamities resulting from wrong-doing. These predictions were uttered by Moses before 1400 B. C. That the Old Testament existed long before the time of Christ is easily shown by reference to Jewish writers, the Septuagint Version, and by the quotations from the New Testament writings, which have already been proved genuine. The infidel historian Gibbon states these Old Testament writings existed as early as 250 B. C., when they were translated from the Hebrew into Greek. Certainly *his* testimony should be acceptable as to the early existence of the prediction.

Though a few of the events described in this chapter of curses for disobedience came upon the Jews at the time of the

Babylonish captivity, yet careful consideration shows many of them did not reach a fulfilment then and so must be referred to a later time. The fulfilment of this prophecy began with the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth; a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand; a nation of fierce countenance, which shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favor to the young." The Romans were literally from "far," and were almost as remote as any people of whom the ancient Israelites knew. Their language was not only different from that of Israel, but it was of a different family of languages. The rapidity of their conquests is well described as "swift as the eagle flieth." And their ruthlessness in war has seldom been surpassed.

Now how could Moses naturally suppose the instrument of Israel's punishment for their rejection of Jehovah and crucifixion of his Son would come from a remote point, the most distant known, would come with rapidity, would speak a strange tongue, and be especially merciless? Had he been guessing, he would have referred their overthrow to one of the several powerful near-by nations which surrounded Israel.

It is further predicted that their destruction was not to result from a battle in the open, although they fought many such battles. Neither was it to be by a surprize attack on their city. "He shall besiege thee in all thy gates." And though this siege was to culminate in the breaking down of their "fenced walls," yet that was not to occur until after a long siege during which there should be awful famine. And during this famine, fathers and mothers would kill and eat their own children. When all these details are compared with the facts as related by the Jewish historian Josephus, who was an eye-witness of those awful events and who describes them in great detail, these ancient predictions of Moses read like history, they so exactly agree with the events.

The unwillingness of skeptics to allow prophecy might cause them to affirm that these remarkable fulfilments are but coincidences, but what insane credulity could attribute to coincidence other details in the predictions that follow? The great slaughter during the siege was to leave them "few in number." Such were the facts. Of those who survived the siege it is pre-

dicted "the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other." "Ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it." The dispersion of the Jews among the nations is well known. No other people has been so widely scattered for so many hundreds of years and yet retained its identity. They are yet today scattered among all nations in both hemispheres. According to recent statistics they are distributed as follows: Central and Western Europe, 9,250,000; United States, 3,300,000; other parts of North America, 125,000; South America, 108,000; Siberia, Central Asia, and Asia Minor, 325,000; Syria and Mesopotamia, 140,000; Northern Africa, 280,000; and in Palestine, less than 100,000.

Yet they were to preserve their identity as a race. So much is implied in the sufferings to beset them in the lands where they were to be scattered. This is one of the marvels of history. Other nations who have been carried away as captives from their native land have been absorbed by the peoples among whom they sojourned. But not so with the Jews. They are as distinct a people today as they were two thousand years ago. Though for nineteen hundred years they have been a race of persecuted wanderers, without a country of their own, without a civil government, the chief ceremonies and institutions of their religion (which had been their main unifying force) gone, yet they maintain a distinct racial existence! May we not ask again, How did Moses know fifteen hundred years before it began to come to pass that such an improbable history should be that of his people?

But is was still further predicted that this people should ever be despised and persecuted. "And among these nations shalt thou find no ease. . . . And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear day and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life" (vs. 65, 66). Such is Jewish history wherever they have gone. Where have they not been despised, persecuted, massacred? In the early centuries of our era, during the Middle Ages, at the time of the Crusades, following the Reformation, in recent centuries cruel massacres have been their portion. These have occurred in Germany, England, France, Spain, Russia, and in almost every land where Jews have lived in considerable numbers. Even today in America, the land of reli-

gious freedom, they are still a persecuted people, opposed by secret societies, by various periodicals and books, and to a considerable extent ostracized by society generally. How did Moses know more than three thousand years ago that such would be the fortunes of his people at this time? Let the skeptic answer.

The evangelist Luke, in describing that same destruction of Jerusalem as foretold by Jesus but forty years before it occurred, said, "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (Luke 21:24). For nearly nineteen hundred years Jerusalem has been in the hands of the Gentiles, and though the Jews have desired and tried earnestly to regain possession of it they have never been able to do so. The Roman emperor Julian the Apostate, for the distinct purpose of disproving this prophecy, endeavored at great expense and trouble to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem and restore it to the Jews; but his efforts were utterly fruitless. The decision of those who have very recently studied the situation critically and at close range is that there is no indication that the Jews will again possess their city. This prediction of Jesus and those of Moses could not have been thus accurately given in detail by any human foresight, but only by revelation of God. Therefore we know they were messengers approved of God.

4. **Predictions Concerning Christ.**—The first prophecy was a prediction of the coming of Christ, and was given immediately after the fall and before the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Eden. It was predicted that the seed of the woman would bruise the head of the serpent, and this was doubtless fulfilled in Christ's overcoming Satan and sin, which were represented by the serpent. The Old Testament Scriptures are filled with predictions of and allusions to the coming Christ and his salvation. That these were written centuries before the events, has been shown. Not only in word-prophecies is this portrayed, but also in acted prophecies, or types and institutions of the Old Testament. The passover lamb was a remarkable prophecy of Christ given fifteen hundred years before the Christian era. A definite and most remarkable word-prophecy is found in Isa. 9:6, 7—"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his

shoulders: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." Because Jesus Christ came and exactly fulfilled these predictions, as no mere man could have done, we have proof, not only of the divine authority of the Scriptures, but also of the divinity of Christ.

The exact time of Christ's coming was foretold by the prophet Daniel in his seventy weeks' prophecy in Dan. 9:24-27. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy" (v. 24). That this prediction refers to Christ is certain from the fact that he is named in verse 26. As in many other time-prophecies of Scripture, the day is here representative of a year, the week meaning, not seven days, but seven years. This was not an idea uncommon to the ancient Jews, for they were well acquainted with the week of years. Their law required that they leave their land untilled every seventh year, that the land might rest as they rested from work each seventh day. The seventy weeks were to be counted from the going forth of the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem mentioned in Ezra 7. This, according to the common Bible chronology, was 457 B. C. Counting seventy weeks, or 490 years, from this date, we have A. D. 33. At this date all the things mentioned had been fulfilled. The first of these events was the anointing of the Most Holy. "Unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and three score and two weeks" (Dan. 9:25). This brings us to 26 A. D., the very year of Christ's baptism and anointing for his ministry. According to all dependable Bible chronologists, Christ was born four years before the common date given for his birth. After the sixty-nine weeks, Messiah was to be cut off. How long after it is not stated in verse 26, but by reference to verse 27 it is learned that in the midst of the week "the sacrifice and the oblation" should cease, which took place when Christ, the true sacrifice, died on the cross. During the three and one half

years following, the covenant was confirmed with many for one week—seven years (see v. 27). Thus the time of the most important events in the history of the world was plainly foretold to the very year nearly five hundred years beforehand.

The place of Christ's birth was foretold as follows: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting" (Mic. 5:2). Here the Son of God is referred to as the Eternal one. This prophecy was uttered seven centuries before Christ came. That Christ was born in Bethlehem is a fact so notorious that comment is unnecessary.

In various scriptures it is predicted that Christ should be descended from Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, and David. The genealogies of Christ given in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke show that it came to pass. His genealogy was on the public records at the time these Gospels were written, and if the Gospel writers had not told the truth, they would certainly have been exposed by opposers. They would not have dared to falsify in so important a matter. On this fulfilment the Jewish Christians would especially rest their faith.

In that wonderful fifty-third chapter of Isaiah are given at least ten separate predictions about Christ the fulfilment of which is so commonly known that the mere mention of the predictions is all that is necessary:

(1) *"There is no beauty that we should desire him"* (v. 2). Because Christ came not with worldly pomp as an earthly king, he was not accepted by the Jews, who were waiting for him.

(2) *"He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief"* (v. 3).

(3) *"But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities"* (v. 5). That he was wounded and bruised undeservingly is well known.

(4) *"He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth"* (v. 7). When falsely accused and abused by his captors, "he answered never a word."

(5) *"He was taken from prison and from judgment"* (v. 8). Neither before nor after his trial was he put in prison as

was Barabbas, and as accused or condemned men are, but was arrested, tried, and executed all in a few hours' time.

(6) *"He was cut off out of the land of the living"* (v. 8). Christ was killed—he did not die a natural death.

(7) *"He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death"* (v. 9). He was buried in the sepulcher intended for a rich man, and it was guarded by wicked soldiers.

(8) *"He shall prolong his days"* (v. 10). After death, his days were to continue, which is a clear prediction of his resurrection from the dead.

(9) *"He was numbered with the transgressors"* (v. 12). He was crucified between two thieves, and died as a criminal.

(10) *"He bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors"* (v. 12). He suffered that others might be saved from suffering for sin, and he prayed for his enemies while he was hanging on the cross.

These predictions indeed read like a fifth Gospel history of the life of Christ. Yet we know on the best authority that they were written hundreds of years before Christ's coming. The many details predicted about Christ, not only those given here, but the many other prophecies so wonderfully and exactly fulfilled, their number, variety, great sweep, the time spanned by them, and their exalted nature, are sure marks of divine foreknowledge.

The prophet Micaiah, when imprisoned by Ahab for prohesying adversely concerning a battle Ahab was soon to enter, said, "If thou return at all in peace, the Lord hath not spoken by me" (1 Kings 22:28). Like Micaiah, we can safely rest the divine authority of the Scriptures upon the fulfilments of its prophecies, because they never fail, and their fulfilment is proof that God has indeed spoken by the Bible.

Chapter III

INTERNAL EVIDENCES

Internal evidences are so designated because they are found within the Bible itself, which is not true for the most part of the evidences thus far considered. In a former chapter a distinction was made between authenticating and rational evidences. The external proofs are authenticating in nature. They furnish reasons why we should believe the Bible is true. Internal evidences are, in a great measure, of the class of rational proofs. While they show why we should BELIEVE the Bible is true, they also, many of them, show why it IS true in important particulars. This class of proofs seeks to show that the Bible teaching is consistent with the character of God and with the nature and needs of man as they may be known from sources other than revelation. It is the argument so ably set forth by Bishop Butler in his famous work "Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed." If the Scriptures are in harmony with the light of nature, if they agree with the intuitions of man's moral reason, if they are adapted to his soul's needs, they must be true; and if in addition they greatly augment the light of nature while they perfectly harmonize with it, they must be from Him who constituted nature. Many of the internal proofs, however, are exclusively authenticating in their nature.

I. Perfect Doctrines

The doctrines of the Scriptures are in harmony with religious truth known intuitively.

1. **God's Being and Attributes.**—Intelligent men everywhere and in all ages have believed in the existence of a personal Supreme Being. This belief has been shown to be the fruit of both the intuitive faculty and the logical reason. God has commonly been regarded as being infinite in all perfections. This is also the idea of God that is presented in the Bible. In this particular the Scriptures are in harmony with the light of nature. But they do not merely tell us what may be known naturally about God. They afford a conception of his being and attributes that is at once recognized as much more perfect than can be known without revelation. No such lofty representation of God is to be found in any other than the Bible religion. The Scriptures could

not be reasonably regarded as divine revelation if they upheld pantheism, as does Hinduism; nor if they taught atheism, as does Buddhism. Neither could they be accepted if they represented God as being cruel, unjust, licentious, or malignant, as heathen religions sometimes represent him. The approval of common sense is upon the delineation of his character as given in the Scriptures.

2. **Man's Moral Responsibility and Freedom.**—The Bible represents man as having been created in the image of God, as possessing moral freedom. It constantly makes prominent the idea that because man has free will he is therefore responsible for his conduct. It states by both principle and precept what he shall do and what he shall not do. It promises reward for obedience and punishment for disobedience. The idea of man's moral responsibility is fundamental in the teachings of Scripture. It is clearly implied in God's dealings with man from the time of his creation. It is implied in every commandment, in every promise of blessing, in all warnings of judgments, in the life and death and atonement of Jesus, and in all the work of salvation. The free moral agency of men is also an intuition. Everywhere men recognize the feeling of ought and ought not. It is so where men are unacquainted with the Bible. If the Bible had denied free will and moral responsibility to man, as various philosophies have done, then its contradiction of man's intuition and feelings of obligation would prove it not to be from God. But its harmony with those great facts of man's consciousness, and especially its greater clearness and light on the subject, is evidence that what the Bible says, God says.

3. **Man's Depravity and Guilt.**—The Scriptures everywhere teach that man is sinful. He is described as being sinful in character as well as in conduct. The origin of sinfulness is shown in the third chapter of Genesis; and all the way through, the Bible makes prominent the idea that this sinfulness of men is a ground for their need of salvation. They are described as guilty and deserving of punishment because of transgression of God's law. Transgression results in sinful character, and sinful character in turn leads to further sinful acts. This sinfulness of character, or depravity of the nature, is specifically mentioned in some texts and definitely implied in many. The Scripture teachings of depravity and guilt agree exactly with the

common consciousness of mankind. This sense of sinfulness is shown among heathen people by their offering propitiatory sacrifices on their altars, and by their various forms of asceticism and penance. The Bible makes clear distinctions between moral and physical evil. It far surpasses for clearness all conceptions of evil that are possible without it, though it is in harmony with men's consciousness in this respect. If it denied moral evil as have philosophies in some instances, if it confused moral with physical evil as is done by some heathen religions, or if it disallowed natural depravity as does Pelagianism, then it could not be accepted as truth, nor as divine revelation. But by recognizing these great truths of human consciousness, and by setting them in a clearer light than can otherwise be known, it shows itself to be, not only truth, but from the Source of truth, by the perfection of its doctrine.

4. **Man's Spirituality and Immortality.**—Another example of the perfect doctrine of the Bible is its teaching that man has a spiritual nature and that he is immortal. The Bible makes a clear distinction between the body and the spirit. The spirit is described as being made in the image of God and as being immortal like him. The immortality of the soul is everywhere assumed in the Bible. It is fundamental to Scriptural teaching generally. Without this doctrine the Bible would be meaningless. Concerning life beyond this life the Bible gives no uncertain sound. It is definite and positive. Materialists deny immortality, and deists and rationalists question it, but men everywhere and in all ages intuitively recognize themselves as being immortal. No man can confidently and constantly deny it. If, like the ancient Sadducees, the Scriptures contradicted the common consciousness and intuition of men concerning immortality, then they could not be accepted as true. But by teaching these truths, the Bible is shown to be true, and by its much greater clearness of teaching about immortality it is shown to be from God.

5. **Present Probation and Future Retribution.**—The Scriptural doctrines already mentioned, especially the idea of moral responsibility, imply another fundamental truth—present probation, or that men in this life are on trial. Present probation necessarily implies still another important fundamental truth—future retribution. The unequal apportionment of the blessings and

sorrows of life is evident on every hand. Not infrequently the wicked man prospers and spreads himself like the green bay-tree, while the righteous suffers affliction, persecution, and even death by martyrdom. All this implies and requires for the sake of justice that there shall be a proper adjustment of rewards and punishments beyond this life. The Bible most clearly and positively teaches probation here and retribution hereafter. In this teaching it is exactly in harmony with the light of nature. All men are naturally conscious of these two truths. In believing them, they believe the teaching of the Bible. To deny free will, moral responsibility, sin, spirituality of man, and immortality logically requires the denial of present probation and retribution hereafter. If the Bible denied any of these fundamental religious truths, it could not be accepted as truth; but its support of them, and especially the definiteness of its teaching, such as men have not known of themselves, is evidence that it is God's Word.

II. Perfect Adaptation to Man's Needs

Besides those doctrines of the Bible that are known more or less by intuition, another class of doctrines is set forth that may be known only by revelation. To this latter category belong such doctrines as the trinity of God, the divine-human nature of Christ, the atonement, salvation by faith, and the resurrection of the body. Though these doctrines are not knowable by intuition nor reason, yet they correspond very remarkably to needs of man's nature and what can be intuitively known. And this exact correspondence commends them to us as being true and of God.

1. **Salvation from Sin and Depravity.**—That man is depraved, guilty, and liable to punishment has been shown. His need of pardon and of restoration from his depraved condition is certain; but nature offers no remedy for his spiritual needs. Men try by their own works to gain justification. They pray, afflict themselves, give alms, and do many other things, but get no assurance of acceptance with God. But the Bible supplies this, man's greatest need. It offers free pardon of sin. Reason says, however, that it is inconsistent with God's holiness for him to pardon except atonement be made to show that God is upright and worthy of respect as moral ruler. Such an atonement is clearly set forth in the Bible. Pardon is granted only through

faith in Christ, who made the atonement. This atonement requires a God-man to effect it, and such is the Savior set forth in the Bible. But pardon of past sins is useless unless the reigning power of depravity is overcome so men can refrain from further sinning. The Bible promises regeneration as an accompaniment of pardon. Here again the provisions of the Bible correspond exactly with the needs of a man in furnishing what he lacks. The doctrines of revealed religion wonderfully complement those of natural religion. They promise the supply of a great need of human nature which is not supplied from any other source. The wonderful adaptation of the supply to the need is strong reason for assuming that the scriptures which make known that supply must be God's revelation.

2. **Enlightenment and Comfort.**—After man is justified and regenerated, he still has needs. His knowledge is too limited to discern what he should do under many of life's circumstances. He is often at a loss to know what would please God, or what course should be followed in affairs which often have an important bearing on his spiritual and eternal well-being. He feels the need of enlightenment and a superior guiding intelligence. And amidst the sorrows and troubles of life, he recognizes the need of a friend who can furnish consolation in his distress. For the supply of these needs the Bible points to the Holy Spirit of God, who will come into the believer's life as a guide and comforter. Here again the supply is exactly adapted to the need. And who but God could have conceived of a supply so perfectly fitted to the need?

3. **Resurrection of the Body.**—A still further illustration of that remarkable correspondence of revealed with natural theology is the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. Doubtless it is not possible by intuition nor the logical reason to know that the dead physical body will be raised to life again. But both intuition and reasoning lead to belief in life after death. The immortality of the soul is commonly believed, without revelation. But man was created both body and spirit. The body is a part of himself, of his essential nature. Is it therefore unreasonable that his body should so soon be lost to him forever? The resurrection of the body, then, is necessary to the satisfaction of a normal and instinctive desire of man's soul and a preservation of an essential part of his nature. The Bible doctrine of the res-

urrection of the dead has done more than all human theories combined effectually to expel the darkness of the tomb. Its adaptation to the supply of so deep a need of man's nature is reason for believing it is true and from God.

Could a religion so wonderfully adapted to man's needs, so perfectly harmonious with the light of nature, so exalted in character have come from any human wisdom, and especially from those humble Galileans by whom Christianity began to be preached?

III. Perfect Morals

The Scriptures very clearly distinguish between right and wrong in men's conduct. The ethical standard of the Bible, and especially as set forth in the teachings of Jesus, is by far the most lofty men have ever known. All men admit that it greatly surpasses any other ever taught. That it is so is evident by comparison of it with the ethics of the wisest and best of human philosophers—Socrates, Plato, or Seneca. Whatever excellence is to be found in the ethical systems of these men they are marred by inconsistencies and glaring errors that place them infinitely below the moral standard of the New Testament. This excellence of the ethical standard of the Bible is further shown by the fact that the leaders of non-Christian religions today are seeking to adapt their moral and ethical standards to those of the religion of Jesus. This standard is not only better than all others, but it is perfect. It not only agrees with our intuitive ideas of right, but the very statements of it leads one intuitively to recognize it as perfectly right. In this perfection is abundant reason, not only for believing it is right, but also for believing it is from God, who alone is perfect.

1. **A Perfect Standard of Right.**—The ethical standard of the Bible is a perfect standard of right because of its comprehensiveness. It enjoins every duty, even the most commonly neglected and misunderstood, and it permits no evil whatsoever. It does not consist of a mere code of rules imposed, but rather of sound general principles. The Bible gives precepts, however, which have great value in giving definiteness to and in illustrating its ethical principles. The great foundational principle of Christian ethics is love. The Bible enjoins supreme love to God and equal love to one's fellow men. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all

thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself." On these hang all the ethical teachings of the Scriptures. He who loves will fulfil all moral precepts. If one loves his fellow men as himself, he will keep the Golden Rule—"All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." It is not merely negative, in forbidding us to do what we would not have others do to us; but it requires that we do positive good to others according to this rule. Such a standard could not be improved. It is in its nature absolutely perfect.

2. **A Perfect Measurement of Conduct.**—Again, the ethics of the Bible are perfect in their method of judging the moral quality of actions. Mere external conformity to right precepts is not accepted as right, except as the motive prompting such actions is right. "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." The motive for an action is that which determines the desert of him who does it. If he mistakenly believes an act is wrong that is not in its essential nature contradictory to any right principle nor precept, he can not perform such an act without incurring guilt before God. Also, if he honestly but ignorantly believes he should do that which is evil according to the absolute standard of right, he may do it with a clear conscience. This is the only right standard of judgment for finite beings. Any other would be wrong, but this is perfect.

3. **Perfect Practicality.**—Though the Bible presents a very exalted standard of morals, yet it can be conformed to by all who will follow its directions. Obedience to the moral requirements of Scripture is natural to one who has that measure of love for God and man which he ought to have. But to have such love it is necessary that the rule of the depraved nature shall be overcome by regeneration, which is possible for all men. Without regeneration and the aid of the Spirit of God, full conformity to the ethical standard of Scripture is impossible. The Bible not only furnishes a perfect standard of conduct, but it also makes provisions for conformity to it. This latter no other teacher of ethics has ever been known to do. Here again is a mark of perfection that indicates divine origin.

IV. Style and Incidental Allusions

A great variety of facts and allusions to be found in the Bible of the nature of circumstantial evidence might be cited in

support of its divine authority. Many of these if taken singly would be inconclusive to most minds, but if considered together they afford positive evidence that is equal in evidential value to a demonstration of the divine authority of the Scriptures. To show the full strength of this branch of Christian evidences would require many volumes; and to state and appreciate them, much learning. We here attempt only brief mention of some of them as indicative of the nature, variety, and irresistible weight of this class of proofs.

1. **Unity of the Scriptures.**—The Bible is composed of sixty-six distinct books, written by at least thirty-six different authors, during a period covering sixteen centuries. These books are not only many in number, but great in variety. Some of them are poetry, some are prose; some are books of law, some are historical writings; some are prophecy and symbols, others are simple epistles. The writers wrote under a variety of circumstances, in many countries, to different peoples, for different purposes, about different subjects, in various conditions, and moved by different influences. These writers belonged to a variety of classes—kings and shepherds, courtiers and cowherds, physicians and farmers, scientific men and mechancis, prophets and priests, military leaders and tax-collectors, lawyers and fishermen, rich and poor, educated and illiterate.

Being written under such conditions, it is altogether improbable that there should be any unity or agreement in the Bible. No other book pretending to unity was ever written under such unfavorable circumstances. And yet the Bible, though composed of sixty-six distinct books, is one book. Though it has not less than thirty-six different human writers, it bears all the marks of being the work of one mind. It has a single subject throughout—the history of the redemption of men through Christ. The same spirit pervades all its books. Their one aim is to lead men to salvation through Christ. At first there may sometimes appear to be divergence and contradiction, but closer investigation shows remarkable agreement. The critics of many centuries have failed to show one real contradiction in the books of the Bible. Where are so many different books other than those of the Bible, written by as many authors, during so many centuries and under such a variety of circumstances, that possess such unity and agreement as a whole? Certainly the writers

could not have planned their work together. The particular writers could not intentionally have fitted their writing to its place in the whole because the whole did not exist until the last book was written. Yet from Genesis to Revelation is apparent a remarkable gradual and progressive unfoldment of truth adapted to the purpose it accomplished.

The only adequate way to account for such unity is to allow that it is what it claims and appears to be—the work of one superintending and inspiring Mind. To attribute it to chance requires a credulity far in excess of that with which skeptics charge Christian believers. As the different parts of a great temple are wrought by numerous workmen, in many places, and under different conditions, yet when brought together they all fit in one great whole because all designed by the single mind of the architect, so the book of revelation, though wrought by many minds, yet has unity and harmony because of the superintendence of the master mind of its Divine Architect.

2. **Languages and Literary Style.**—Every living language constantly undergoes change. New terms are added, old ones become obsolete, and meanings of terms and idioms vary. Some scholars find three distinct periods in the history of the Hebrew language. The first is that of the writings of Moses. To the second period belong the books of Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, the poetical books, and several of the earlier prophets. This is the period of the purest Hebrew. To the third period belong the later prophets and remaining historical books. In this period many foreign words, phrases, and idioms became incorporated with the pure Hebrew. Shortly after the last book of the Old Testament was written, the Hebrew became a dead language. The Jews adopted the Aramaic language from those among whom they had spent the exile. All books written in the pure Hebrew must have been written about or before the time that change from the Hebrew to Aramaic took place. But the important point in all this in support of the genuineness of the Old Testament books is that this gradual change in the language as found in these books agrees exactly with the claims of the books themselves as to the time of their origin.

The Greek language also underwent many changes with the passing of the centuries. The New Testament was not written in the Greek of Homer, nor even in the classical Greek of Plato

and Aristotle, but in that common Greek dialect which became prevalent in many lands of the East following the conquests of Alexander. With that common Greek in the New Testament is also mixed many Hebraisms. It is exactly such language as would be expected from men of ordinary literary training in circumstances such as those of the New Testament writers and at that time. Here is very strong proof of the genuineness of the Bible—that its books were written at the time and under the conditions to which they are commonly referred.

Likewise the literary style of the sacred books is in harmony with what might be expected of men of their literary attainments and circumstances. The distinct differences in style in these various books show them to be the work of different minds, not the product of forgery by an imposter. The style of each writer is in exact harmony with his character as portrayed in the writings of himself and other Biblical writers.

A still further confirmation is in the peculiar style of the various writers. Most of them were men of plain common sense with limited education. Paul was one who was educated and well read. The other writers use simple plain language, with no attempt at ornament of style. But when we come to Paul, the scholar, a larger vocabulary is noticed and the style of a man of culture appears. Also the peculiarities of the characters of the men themselves, as we know them from what is said about them, are shown forth in the writings of each. The boldness, energy, and zeal which characterizes Paul as Luke describes him in the Acts, are exactly the characteristics manifested in Paul's epistles. These many incidental corroborations are not to be found in spurious writings.

3. **Historical Events.**—The history recorded in the Bible has been shown to correspond very precisely with what may be known from other sources concerning the same subjects. The Bible is very largely a book of history, and none can deny that its history has a general agreement with secular history. Critics have found various points in the Bible history that were supposed at first to conflict with secular history, and as usual they were ready to attribute error to the Bible. An example of this is the mention in the Bible of Belshazzar as king of the Chaldeans. At an earlier period secular history gave no record of him; but in recent years Sir Henry Rawlinson has shown, by deciphering

cuneiform inscriptions, that he was regent during the absence from Babylon of his father Nabonidus, the last of the Chaldean kings. Here is evidence that the Book of Daniel was written by one who knew about this comparatively unimportant fact of history so intimately that he could give it its proper setting in the narrative. It must therefore have been written near the time of the events described.

But the Bible abounds with historical allusions that required on the part of the writers a familiarity with the facts that is altogether improbable to any except those who lived at the time they are said to have lived. The names of the several rulers who the Bible states ruled various parts of Palestine during different periods, and under various limitations, and with different titles, agree precisely with the facts as furnished by authentic history of contemporary writers whose works have come down to us. Other incidental historical allusions that might be mentioned as examples of many others that are remarkably corroborated by dependable secular history is the variation of opinion among the Jews in Jesus' day concerning whether it was lawful to pay "tribute to Cæsar," and the banishing of the Jews from Rome by Claudius Cæsar (Acts 18:2). Such historical accuracy in minute details is possible only to a contemporary writer.

4. **Incidental Allusions.**—Probably of all the internal evidences none have greater evidential value in proof of the genuineness and authenticity of the Bible for one who is willing patiently to investigate them and carefully weigh them than the many incidental allusions to customs, to contemporary history, to topography of the country traversed, and to personal characteristics of historic characters.

An example of incidental allusion to customs is that of the anointing of Jesus' feet by the woman who was a sinner. During the process of the meal, she came into the Pharisee's house where Jesus was reclining at the table as was the custom, the feet extending backward away from the table. And "she stood at his feet behind him . . . and anointed them with the ointment." Only one living in a land where the custom of reclining at the table was prevalent would ever think of making such an allusion to that custom. Many such examples might be cited, but they are available in commentaries and works on Bible history.

Incidental allusions to the nature of the country traversed by the Israelites in passing from Egypt to Canaan, by Jesus in his journeyings, or by the apostle Paul in his missionary tours furnishes much circumstantial evidence that the writers were witnesses of the territory described. For an appreciation of these allusions in the description of Paul's journeys, a thoughtful reading of Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul" is helpful. The evidence is conclusive that the writer was Paul's fellow traveler, as is intimated in the account, and an eye-witness of the things described. Here is proof that this part of the Bible was not forged during the Middle Ages, as uninformed skeptics sometimes insinuate.

A single example of the correctness of character-sketches of historic persons mentioned in the Bible is that of Herod the Great. The Gospel writer tells of his insane jealousy of the infant Jesus when the magi inquired for him who was "born king of the Jews," of his subtle scheme to find Jesus that he might kill him, and of his cruel slaughter of the infants in Bethlehem. The weight of this proof is better realized in the light of the character of Herod as revealed in history. He was one of the cruelest and most jealous men mentioned in all the annals of the world's history. His jealous hate led him to murder his wife's brother Aristobulus, the aged prince Hyrcanus, his own wife, Mariamne, whom he had loved very much, and his two sons Alexander and Aristobulus. How remarkable that Matthew should record of this same Herod that deed of revolting cruelty with which Bible readers are familiar!

If the Bible were deprived of all the external evidences of its divine origin, it would still contain in its own pages abundant credentials of its divine authority, in its perfect doctrines, unrivaled ethics, perfect adaptation to man's needs, literary style, and in the vast number of allusions, all of which can be accounted for only on the ground that it is divinely inspired and written by its alleged writers.

Chapter IV

EXPERIMENTAL AND COLLATERAL EVIDENCES

The manifestation of the supernatural in any form in connection with the Scriptures or with Christianity is that which proves them to be of God. That in relation to Christianity which can not be adequately accounted for on natural grounds, if it meets other requirements, may be appealed to as Christian evidence. Branches of evidence already described are manifestations of supernatural knowledge in the utterance of prophecy, and the manifestation of supernatural holiness and wisdom in a perfect moral and religious standard contained in the Scriptures. Now we purpose to show the manifestation of the supernatural in the effects of Christianity in the inner consciousness and also in the character and conduct of the individual believer, as well as on society as a whole where it is preached.

As a tree may be known by its fruits, so, Jesus taught, we may know teachers of religion. Also, it is proper to judge religions themselves by their fruits. Such a form of testing is universally approved and very convincing. If a tree bears good fruit, the goodness of the tree can not be questioned. If the fruits of Christianity are good, then it must be good; and if good, it must be of God, as it claims. If, however, it is not from God, its claim is false and it is evil; but if evil, its fruit would be evil. Because its fruit is good, therefore we know it is good and of God.

I. Evidences from Christian Experience

The experimental evidence is the most convincing and has been described as being the most powerful of all Christian evidences. It is one that may be easily comprehended and appreciated by the most illiterate and yet is worthy of respect from the most learned. It is open to all for both observation and trial. It is the one especially on which most true Christians rest their faith.

1. **Nature of Experimental Evidence.**—The argument from Christian experience is like that of the man born blind whose eyes Jesus opened and who said to the critics, "One thing I

know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see." Likewise the Christian believer knows as positively and certainly that once he was bowed down beneath a burden of guilt and was a slave of sinful desire, but that now his soul is filled with peace and he is free from the bondage of sin. Millions of the best and greatest persons of all the Christian centuries have testified to such an experience, and it is unreasonable to believe they were all deceived in this great truth of their own consciousness. Skeptics may deny the divine power of Christianity, but in doing so they make themselves ridiculous to those who have experienced its transforming influence. An experience in the consciousness of Christians may not have direct evidential value to unbelievers; but when millions of honest and intelligent believers throughout the world and during many centuries testify constantly to such an experience, their testimony ought to be received. But we are not dependent upon their testimony. In the individual lives of believers there comes at the time of conversion a very radical change of character and outward conduct. This change is often so definite and extraordinary that it can be properly attributed to nothing else than the miraculous power of God. These are modern miracles that occur daily and in every city or village in lands where evangelical Christianity is preached. Truly God has not left his truth without witness.

As a means of showing the force of the experimental evidence, the argument has been illustrated somewhat as follows: Suppose a contagious disease should break out, such as was the Spanish-influenza epidemic which spread over the earth at the close of the World War, and cause great suffering and death to millions. Suppose that when it begins to rage in the United States, intelligence should be received that a medicine made from the root of a tree growing in South America is a certain cure. The President of the United States at once sends a ship to South America for a supply of the medicine. In due time the ship returns with a cargo of what is claimed and appears to be the medicine. Soon it is in circulation, and thousands of persons in every State who are ill with the disease take the medicine and every one is instantly cured. These begin to urge the sick and dying about them to try the medicine.

But certain persons who are interested in the spread of the disease raise such questions as "How do you know the ship

sent by the President actually brought its cargo from South America?'' or ''How do you know this is that particular root?'' Suppose they should charge the crew and officers with being wilful deceivers, or with ignorance as to the real source of the cargo they brought. Or suppose such critics should begin examining the roots for faults; or should attempt to disprove the curative qualities of the medicine by pointing to persons not cured who professed to have taken the medicine but who had not done so, or should openly deny that the medicine cures by telling us the sick persons were not sick, or if so, only imagined they were cured. Such opposers would make themselves ridiculous by such questions and criticisms, and become a laughing-stock to all sound-thinking men. Such, however, is the ridiculous position of those who deny the divine origin of Christianity. It cures man's moral malady. This is proof it is from God. If the medicine cures the disease with no bad effects, the other questions are of little concern to us.

2. **Effects of Christian Experience in Consciousness.**—The claim of the Bible to be the book of salvation is in exact harmony with the experience of multitudes of Christian believers who find by following its directions such deep peace and soul-satisfaction as constitutes certain evidence to them of the correctness of its claim. No knowledge can be more certain to its possessor than the knowledge of his own inner thoughts, emotions, desires, motives, and intentions. One of sinful character and vicious life is conscious of thoughts and emotions of a corresponding nature. He is conscious of a feeling of guilt before God, and of the impelling influence of his depraved nature to sinful deeds. He is cognizant of a love for the impure, and of a desire for association with the vicious rather than with the righteous.

But suppose he submits himself to the claims of the gospel, and trusts in the mercy of God through Christ for salvation. Suddenly he cognizes a change in his inner consciousness—he is pardoned and converted. He feels like a new creature. It is not merely a change of belief, but of heart. He finds his affections no longer set on sinful and worldly things, but on that which is holy. Until recently he had hated God and despised his people, but now he loves God supremely and finds unspeakable pleasure in worshiping him. And his heart is overflowing with tender affection for God's people; he had formerly

wished to avoid them, but now they are his dearest companions and he would live with them forever. He now detests those things he once loved, and thirsts for holiness. Prayer, which he once ridiculed, is now his chief delight. His heart, once hard, has suddenly become tender and full of compassion. A violent temper has become peaceful and mild. Where once selfishness reigned supreme, now exists a benevolent desire to do good. The selfish pride that once actuated him is now supplanted by feelings of deep humility. And, better still, instead of those feelings of guilt that formerly filled his soul with unrest and bitterness, he now feels perfect peace with God and "joy unspeakable and full of glory." He is happy beyond expression.

Such a sudden and radical change is not imaginary, but very real and common. It has been the experience of myriads of Christians throughout the ages. These changes are as certain to their consciousness as any other facts of inner consciousness. They know them as certainly as they know their own existence. Such experience is, to those who possess it, undeniable and direct proof that Christianity is of God. And their testimony ought to be received by others as valid evidence of its divine origin.

3. **Effects of Christian Experience on Character.**—Christian experience affects, not only the inner consciousness of the believer, but also his character and outward conduct. The skeptic may reject the testimony of Christians concerning their consciousness of an inner change, but this radical change in outward conduct that accompanies belief in Christ is apparent even to unbelievers. That inner change of the affections, inclinations, and desires that accompanies conversion is followed by a corresponding change in conduct from sinning to a life of holiness. The extent of this outward change is determined by the degree of one's depravity and sinfulness. The change was very marked in the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. One moment he was a most bitter and determined opposer of Christianity, a proud enemy of righteousness wholly given up to persecution of Christ; the next he was a humble penitent, calling on Jesus in the spirit of full submission. A few days later he was preaching the gospel in the synagogs of Damascus. The change was sudden and complete in his whole character and conduct.

Such changes in character at the time of conversion are not a few obscure instances. They are common to Christians in all ages and places. Men of profligate life, abandoned to wickedness, slaves of evil habits, are instantly changed. The change does not result from their own will-power, but their desire for sinful pleasure is suddenly removed. Evil habits from which they had tried in vain for years to free themselves are suddenly broken, and they find themselves free to choose their own course of conduct. Yea, more, they find within them a tendency to do those things that are right. This change in outward conduct is often so marked that one must be credulous indeed to refer it to any natural power of man.

That these effects are produced by the power of God through the gospel is evident from the fact that they are never found except where the gospel is preached and accepted. It is as reasonable to believe these are the fruits of the gospel as to believe the grapes gathered from a vine were produced by it rather than by a thorn-tree. The skeptic may say that these effects are the natural result of believing the teaching of the Bible. But if belief in a system of untruth can produce such salutary effects, why can not men produce other systems of doctrine that will bring similar results? Why can not infidels, with all their boasted learning, invent a system of philosophy that will produce some changes in men's lives? Why has no other system producing such results ever been heard of in any age throughout all the earth? Other beliefs have produced strong excitement, and effected great emotion, but only the gospel transforms men's lives instantaneously.

Added force is given to the present argument by contrasting the lives of Christians with those of infidels. As a class, Christians have always been noted for goodness of character and uprightness of conduct. It is true particular persons professing to be Christians are sometimes untrue to their profession and live sinful lives, but these are always regarded as hypocritical and exceptions to the rule. Also infidels in some instances are fairly upright in their conduct. But where evangelical Christianity is prevalent, to say a man is a Christian is to imply that he is of upright moral character; to say, however, one is an infidel is to lead one's hearers to think he is probably immoral and profligate in his manner of living. These

reputations of the two classes are the result of men's observation and experience.

That Christians whose hearts are engaged in their faith live moral lives scarcely needs to be stated. It is Christians as a class who go about doing positive good. They are the ones who seek out the poor and feed them. They are the ones who deny themselves that others less fortunate may be spared greater suffering. They establish homes for orphans, the aged, the blind, and the deaf and dumb. They found hospitals and schools, and in every noble work of benevolence take the lead. They unselfishly go to the ends of the earth to uplift humanity. Infidels may, when moved by humanitarian sentiments, by a selfish desire for men's approbation, or through influences of the beneficent principles of Christianity, engage in such good works in a measure; but the fact remains, nevertheless, that Christians as a class are more commonly given to such things.

The truest measure of the morality of infidels as a class are their greatest and most respected leaders. They might be regarded as its finished products. They have formulated its principles, and a stream is seldom purer than its source. What is the exact extent of that boasted morality of infidelity as manifested by its greatest leaders? Hume, that prince of skeptics, is regarded by one of his friends in skepticism as being as nearly virtuous as human frailty will permit; but when we remember his teaching that suicide is commendable, that adultery is necessary to obtain all life's advantages, and that female infidelity, when known, is a light matter, and when not known is nothing, we can not help wondering how pure the conduct of one must have been who held such standards. Bolingbroke was a libertine whose intemperance and lust were unrestrained. Blount shot himself because his sister-in-law whom he had solicited to marry him refused. Tindal was given to vice in general and a total want of principle. Voltaire was noted for a violent and malignant temper, and a disregard of all the ties and decencies of the family circle. Rousseau confessed he was a liar, a thief, and a debauched profligate; besides his intercourse with lewd women, he ruined the characters of other women, and left his illegitimate children to be cared for by the charity of the public. Thomas Paine's first wife is said to have died from ill-usage; his second wife left him because of neglect and unkindness; and

the third was really the wife of another man on whose hospitality Paine lived while he seduced the wife. He was found guilty of a breach of trust in an office given him by Congress, which made necessary his resignation. And the lady in whose house he died related that he was drunk daily. Such are fair examples of the morals of the greatest modern infidels. What a contrast are the holy lives of the greatest leaders of Christianity!

4. **Effects of Christianity at the Hour of Death.**—The hour of death is an honest hour. It is proper to test and contrast the fruits of Christianity and infidelity in that solemn experience. The true Christian has victory over the grave, and sin; the sting of death is gone. Long ago one who had witnessed the death of good men said, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his." What can be more sublime, more beautiful, more perfectly triumphant than the passing of a righteous man to a better and brighter world? How many, as they have stood on the threshold of the other world and obtained their first view of its glories, have turned back for a moment to tell sorrowing friends of the unspeakable joy and great confidence they possessed! Thousands of dying saints have spent their last breath in expressions of ecstatic joy and of blessed hope of a glorious future. Like the apostle Paul when the eternal reward was just before, many have triumphed in having kept the faith of Christ. But who ever heard of one who had been a true Christian expressing regret that he had submitted to the claims of the gospel? Some have lamented the fact that they had not been better Christians; but none has ever been known, when death came, to be sorry he had trusted in Christ.

But how do infidels die? Does their infidelity bring comfort and joy to them then? As they face the solemn change, do they sing songs of joy; has one of them ever been known to shout in triumph at the prospect? Do they find sustaining power and hope in their infidel theories? Do their faces beam with rapturous pleasure as they face the open grave? The question needs no answer. In the very nature of it, infidelity can give no consolation in death. It is true they may in some instances die calmly and with apparent resignation; but such resignation is not due to their principles of infidelity; it is due rather to their recognition of the fact that death is inevitable

and that it is useless to struggle against it. Whatever of such resignation there may be, or whatever lack of fear there may be in the death of some infidels, there is no brightness, no joy, no happy anticipation there.

Many infidels have given up their infidelity when they came to face death. A notable example of this is Voltaire, that prince of scoffers. When told by his physician that he could live but a short time, he said, "Then I shall go to hell." Though surrounded by infidels who attempted to keep him stedfast in his infidelity, yet he sent for a minister, signed a recantation of infidelity, and professed to die in the church. His death was horrible. One witness stated it was "too terrible to be sustained." His physicians said, "The death of the impious man was terrible indeed." Paine also, when near death, gave up his own infidel teaching. Other prominent skeptics have died similar deaths. How hopeless is the death of a skeptic! but how blessed the death of the Christian!

Christianity cures man's spiritual ailments. Its fruit is good. It gives inner joy, peace, satisfaction, and pure affections to the Christian believer. It makes his heart right, and by so doing causes his outward conduct to be holy. And as he approaches the inevitable and solemn hour of death, he has a wonderful consolation that sustains him, a blessed hope of a life beyond this life, and a joy that bears him above all his troubles. As surely as a tree is known by its fruits, as truly as men do not gather grapes of thorns nor figs of thistles, so certainly is Christianity proved by the excellent fruit it bears to be a good tree and of God's own planting.

II. Effects of Christianity on Society

Nothing is stronger evidence of the goodness of Christianity than its beneficent influence on society as a whole where it has been given place. The force of this argument is best shown by contrasting the state of society in Christian lands with that in lands where the saving influences of the gospel have not gone. Some of the non-Christian lands of today which have come under the influence of that exalted civilization developed in Christian lands, owe much of their civilization to Christianity. But even in these lands the moral standards of society present a great contrast to those of Christian lands. For a fairer test, however, contrast those countries now blessed with the gospel

with what they were before Christianity was preached there. To avoid the charge of unfairness, compare with our Christian civilization that of ancient Greece and Rome as it was when the gospel was first preached. There and at that time heathenism exhibited an example of its best in learning, philosophy, science, art, morals, and civilization. History usually describes only the glory of those ancient peoples, and is silent about their shame. But when we more closely examine that civilization of which skeptics boast, what degradation do we find! Gross obscenity formed a prominent part of their religious rites. Cruelty, murder, suicide, polygamy, infanticide, slavery, oppression, and various other forms of vice and immorality too vile to mention were not only common, but approved by law, religion, and public sentiment. And many of these forms of wickedness were practised, not only by the more degraded of society, but by their greatest philosophers and moralists.

What is true of the degradation of these ancient non-Christian nations and of their uplift by the gospel is also true among modern heathen peoples where the gospel has been preached. The purifying power of the gospel on society has been demonstrated in many lands where Christian missions have been conducted, but no more striking examples of the renovation of society can be found than that of the degraded cannibals of the South Sea Islands. There where the grossest forms of sin were practised, in a few years after the gospel began to be preached all was changed. The wave of vice and crime that followed the rejection of Christianity in France and Russia at the time of their respective revolutions is striking evidence that even modern civilization gets its high standards of morality from the gospel. Exalted moral standards and high civilization are now and always have been coextensive with the spread of the gospel and proportionate in degree to its real acceptance. Inasmuch as Christianity is calculated in its very nature to produce such results, this is certain evidence that such desirable conditions are the fruits of Christianity.

1. Promotion of Universal Brotherhood by the Gospel.—In heathen lands stranger and enemy have been almost synonymous. But the principles set forth by the gospel in the Golden Rule, the Great Commandment, and the parable of the Good Samaritan have done much to produce feelings of universal brotherhood.

The extreme cruelty of ancient heathenism is well represented in its gladiatorial combats, its inhuman treatment of prisoners of war and slaves, or its terrible persecution of Christians. Human life was cheap in pagan Rome. Murder and suicide were common. A large number of her emperors were assassinated and many other prominent men committed suicide. Many died violent deaths in the arena for the amusement of even her most refined society. Rome, Athens, and Corinth had no hospitals, nor other charitable institutions for the orphan, the aged, and the infirm.

But the salutary influences of the gospel have given a sanctity to human life that has greatly lessened murder and suicide and set public sentiment thoroughly against them. Christianity has ameliorated the condition of slaves and has in modern times led to the complete abolition of slavery as an institution in Christian lands. It has outlawed dueling, mitigated the cruelties of war, and is rapidly creating such a strong feeling against war as threatens to abolish it completely. It has made drunkenness and other forms of vice illegal. And the strong feeling of brotherhood and equality created in Christian lands has done much to destroy class-feeling and to overthrow oppressive government. Such results follow in proportion as evangelical Christianity is given place.

2. Domestic Relations Sanctified by the Gospel.—It is well known that the condition of womankind is improved in proportion to the progress of Christianity. Heathenism has usually made her to rank with the beasts of burden and regarded her as the property of her husband, as his slave, to serve him, to be sold, beaten, or killed as he chooses. Polygamy has been common among non-Christian nations. But the gospel exalts women to an equal place and participation with men in all the advantages and benefits of society. A polygamist is regarded in Christian lands as a monster. Not only women, but also children have been lifted up by the gospel. One of the most shocking aspects of morals in ancient Greece and Rome was the prevalence of infanticide. Their people were "without natural affection." In almost all the states of Greece and Rome, the murder of one's own new-born children, or their abandonment to hunger and wild beasts, was allowed by law and approved by public sentiment. One so humane as Plutarch mentions as a merit such abandon-

ment of all his children by Attalus, king of Pergamos. The greatest sages, philosophers, and moralists of Greece—Solon, Plato, and Aristotle—upheld infanticide by arguing in favor of it. Rome also was dyed with the blood of her murdered infants. In Rome, not only was infanticide common, but the law gave the father power to kill or sell into slavery his adult children at his will. Also he might legally dismiss his wife if he chose, and even for trivial offenses put her to death. Surely it is the gospel, above all other influences, that eliminates the oppression of the weak by the strong.

To whatever extent true Christianity reigns in a community, to that extent the blessings of the highest civilization are its portion. There labor is ennobled, industry is encouraged, progress is promoted, learning is advanced, science and art are developed, pauperism is eliminated, and vice, crime, cruelty, and oppression are overcome. In society the fruits of Christianity have always proved to be good. "An evil tree can not bring forth good fruit." Therefore Christianity is good and from God.

III. Rapid Spread of Christianity in Its Beginning

Three hundred years after the beginning of Jesus' personal ministry, the whole Roman world had deserted paganism and become nominally Christian, and the gospel had been preached in the remotest countries of the then-known world. No other religion under such conditions and by such means has ever been known to spread so rapidly. The natural causes were entirely inadequate to produce the marvelous results accomplished by early Christianity.

1. **Hindrances to the Spread of Christianity.**—The new religion had to surmount several obstacles any one of which naturally was in itself sufficient to bar the progress of the gospel. (1) Christianity excluded all other religions. Not only Judaism, out of which it grew, but also paganism was held to be worthless, and Christianity called all men to forsake them and follow its teachings. (2) The natural result of such exclusiveness was to incur the hatred and opposition of the powerful priesthoods of all those religions. The Jewish priesthood were the chief opposers of Jesus and his apostles in Jerusalem, and it was those who obtained their living by the service of Diana that persecuted Paul in Ephesus. (3) The magistrates and other

civil authorities were led by the priests to oppose the gospel, as in the crucifixion of Christ. (4) The wisdom of the Jewish doctors and of the heathen philosophers was arrayed against Christianity because it set their wisdom at naught. (5) The common people were opposed to it naturally because it was against their sins. It told them they were wrong, and stripped them of their self-righteousness: (6) The crucifixion of the leader of the movement while it was in its infancy brought discouragement and depression in the beginning of the work. With such powerful odds against it, the wonder is that the gospel did not perish at its very start. The fact that it was able triumphantly to surmount all these is evidence that there was a supernatural power supporting it.

2. **Natural Inadequacy of the Means Employed.**— Also, the means employed were naturally altogether inadequate to the results accomplished. (1) It was generally propagated by unlearned men of a despised race. This fact makes the obstacles to the progress of the gospel appear the more formidable. The Jews were regarded by the ruling classes as barbarians and as the most despised of all such. The apostles were mostly of the class known as the Galileans, who were despised even by other Jews. The apostles were generally ignorant of the teaching of the great Jewish theologians and of the heathen philosophies. Truly God chose the weak things of the world to confound the mighty. They had no wealth to give them influence, no strong arm of civil power to sustain them, and they did not court human favor. (2) The message itself was an invitation to believe in a crucified Jew not merely as a good man, nor as a prophet, nor as a king, but as the Son of God. This claim to divinity would have been against the success of Christianity even if Christ had been an honored philosopher of Greece; but being a Jew and having been subjected by a Roman governor to a death such as was inflicted only on the lowest criminals, it seems that the gospel would have been the least likely of all messages to find acceptance. (3) The message was repugnant to men naturally, because it demanded that a person utterly forsake, not only especially vile sins, but all sin, and much more—all that he had—father, mother, brother, sister, wife, children, houses and lands, and his own life also. The marvel is that such a message should ever be accepted by any one. The inade-

quacy of the means to accomplish the results attained leads to the conclusion that, as was claimed, the invisible power and Spirit of God worked through these humble messengers and their message.

3. **The Rapidity of the Spread of Christianity Is Unparalleled.**—That the gospel made wonderful progress has already been stated. During the seventy years from 30 to 100 A. D., strong churches were raised up throughout the whole Roman world. Even far-off Britain, it is said, first heard the gospel during that time. When we compare this with the slow progress of heathen religions and philosophies, it is astonishing. The only religion whose progress approaches to that of Christianity is Mohammedanism. But the circumstances and means employed were such as naturally favored its spread. The rapidity of its progress is the only point of similarity with Christianity. Mohammed was, by marriage, rich, Christ was poor. Mohammed was of a powerful and honorable family in Mecca, the most respected city of his nation; Christ was of an unknown family in an obscure village in despised Galilee. Mohammed began his work among the chief people of Mecca; Jesus chose his first twelve disciples from among the unlearned fishers on the shores of Galilee. Mohammed began in an age favorable to the acceptance of his religion, an age noted for ignorance and superstition, and described by historians as the "Dark Ages"; Christianity began to be propagated in the Augustan Age, the golden age of Rome, when the science, philosophy, and theology of the ancients was in the full blaze of its glory. Mohammedanism arose in Arabia among an ignorant and barbarous people, in one of the least enlightened parts of the world; Christianity arose in the metropolis of a nation noted for literature and intelligence, among schools and synagogs. Mohammed was favored by divisions in both social and political conditions; Jesus appeared in a time of universal peace, when all false religions were at liberty to combine against him. Mohammed required no self-denial of his followers, but rather sanctioned the strongest passions. He enticed human nature. But the gospel repelled it, requiring self-denial and suffering. As long as Mohammed depended upon persuasion alone, he gained very few disciples. Only when he took the sword and gave men the choice between conversion and death did he gain many converts. Early Christianity resorted to no

such forcible means, but depended only upon the preaching of the gospel. The spread of Mohammedanism was due to these adequate natural means. It is as easily explained as the spread of the power of Alexander, or Cæsar, or Napoleon. But the natural agencies employed in the spread of early Christianity were entirely inadequate to the results accomplished. Only on the ground that God was with Christ and his apostles can the success of early Christianity be accounted for. This success was a miracle, and possible only with the power and favor of God.

Chapter V

INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES

I. Fact and Nature of Inspiration of Scripture

With the rise of the destructive higher criticism, the subject of the inspiration of the Scriptures has a significance such as it never had before. The fact of inspiration, that the Bible is divinely inspired in some sense or in some parts, is generally accepted by professed Christians. The real problem confronting us is the nature of its inspiration.

1. **Proof of Inspiration.**—That the Christian Bible is not an ordinary human book, but is in some sense from God, is readily shown by the sound proofs of its authenticity and credibility, by the miracles that attested its writers as divinely appointed messengers of truth, by its predictions of future events in many details such as is only possible to God, by its uplifting effects upon the individual and society, and by its perfection in moral standards, doctrines, simplicity and unity of parts, and perfect adaptation to man's needs. The proof that the Bible is a divine revelation is reason for believing God would not have left its writing to human fallibility, but would have so directed it that it should accurately express his truth. Jesus testified to the inspiration of the Old Testament by quoting it as "the Word of God" (Mark 7:13), and by stating "the Scriptures can not be broken [or err]" (John 10:35). "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. 3:16), is the statement of Paul concerning the Old Testament Scriptures. And of the same writings Peter said, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter 1:21). The same writer also refers to the writings of the apostle Paul as being Scripture along with the "other Scriptures" or Old Testament (2 Pet. 3:16). But the strongest proof of the fact of divine inspiration of the Scriptures is in the internal characteristics indicative of supernatural wisdom and knowledge.

2. Various Theories of Inspiration.—The subject of inspiration is a difficult problem, and one concerning which much misunderstanding exists. From an early date, extreme notions of inspiration have been common with both Jews and Christians. The Jewish rabbis of two thousand years ago held the Mosaic writings in such reverence that they affirmed that God handed them down

to Moses already written. According to their tradition, when Moses went up into Mount Sinai he found Jehovah making the ornamental letters in the book of the law! They held the book of the law to be so divine that God himself spent three hours each day studying it! Also the Mohammedans assert concerning their Koran that it was communicated direct by the angel Gabriel from the original copy which is preserved in heaven, that it was written in perfect Arabic, and that through all succeeding centuries it has been preserved from all error or inaccuracies of copyists by a miraculous divine guardianship.

The early Christians, as well as those in the Middle Ages, held a very high theory of the inspiration of the Scriptures, with some of the extreme views of the rabbis. The reformer Luther, with his bold religious thought, was inclined to judge the Scriptures freely, even calling the Epistle of James "an epistle of straw" because it seemed to contradict Paul's teaching of justification by faith. But Luther's immediate successors were strong supporters of a high inspiration, due to their Protestant idea of an infallible Book, instead of the infallible Church theory of Rome.

Many theories of inspiration are held at present, varying from mere natural or intuitional inspiration on the one extreme to absolute mechanical dictation on the other. The natural-inspiration theory holds that the inspired writers merely possessed a higher development of the natural insight into truth which is common to all men to some degree, or a mode of intelligence in morals and religion similar to that possessed by great artists or philosophers in their branches. This theory is commonly held by the present-day religious liberalists and higher critics. It is faulty in that it would make the Bible a mere human book, without authority to obligate men's consciences, and on a level with the Koran, Vedas, or other sacred books. Moreover, such a theory is self-contradictory in that the writers of one religion are inspired to write what those of another are inspired to pronounce false. It is, in fact, a denial of the divine inspiration of the Bible.

The dictation theory, on the other hand, is highly supernatural, making the Bible almost entirely a divine product, leaving to the human writers only the place of passive instruments. It is true that the Ten Commandments were written

directly by the finger of God, and in a few instances God's words spoken by an audible voice are recorded; but the bulk of the Bible was given *by God through men.* This theory of dictation fails to account for the manifestly human element in the Scriptures, the peculiarities in style that characterize and distinguish the productions of each writer from those of the others; it is inconsistent with what we know of the interworking of the human and divine in our conversion, and in other operations; it is also improbable that God would tell the writers many of these facts of Bible history that they already knew. In fact, this dictation theory, though held by many unthinking people in the past, is at present held by almost no thoughtful person, even among the most conservative Christians.

3. **True Nature of Inspiration.**—As already intimated, the true theory must allow both the human and the divine element in the production of the Bible. There is abundant proof of the existence of both these elements there. Extremists who have grasped but one side of these proofs have given undue prominence to either the human or the divine to the exclusion of the other. But the great problem is to determine what is the extent of each of these elements and to know exactly the point where the human ends and the divine begins. Probably, as with the twofold nature of Christ, it is not possible for us to know this exactly; yet sufficient may be known positively to furnish us a practical understanding of Biblical inspiration.

Before we attempt to define inspiration, let it be said that it is to be distinguished clearly from revelation. Noah and Abraham received revelations from God but no proof exists that they were inspired of God to write. In Matt. 9:9 is the record of the call of Matthew. In recording this, Matthew did not need any revelation of the fact, as that was known by natural means. Daniel's prediction of the time of Christ's coming (Dan. 9:24) was revealed to Daniel by Gabriel in a vision, but was written at a subsequent time. Inspiration, therefore, does not imply revelation. The patriarchs Noah and Abraham had divine revelation, but no divine inspiration. Matthew had divine inspiration, but no divine revelation as far as we know. Daniel had divine revelation at one time and at a subsequent time had divine inspiration to write what had been revealed previously. Doubtless ordinarily the Scripture writers, especially the

writers of the Psalms, prophetical books, and the epistles, had both divine revelation and divine inspiration at the time they wrote. But the fact that they had both of these simultaneously is no evidence that the one is included in the other. To regard inspiration as including revelation leads to confusion and vagueness in thought. Revelation has to do with God's imparting and man's receiving of truths; but inspiration has to do especially with the publication of truths, whether those truths have been acquired supernaturally, as in the case of Daniel referred to, or naturally as with the call of Matthew. But the mode of the learning of these truths has nothing whatever to do with the extent of the divine inspiration in the publication of them. Matthew's record, therefore, is not less inspired than Daniel's. Failure to make this distinction has often been the foundation for objection to the full inspiration of the Bible. "This distinction between revelation and inspiration is commonly made by systematic writers" (Hodge, Systematic Theology, Vol. I., page 156).

There is no proof, Scriptural or rational, that all parts of the Bible are not equally inspired. But there is both Scriptural and rational grounds for holding full inspiration, that all parts are equally inspired. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. 3:16). I am aware that this rendering has been questioned; but such a sense in the original is supported by so eminent a Greek church father as Chrysostom and this reading by such modern scholars as DeWette, Bishops Moberly and Wordsworth, Archbishop Trench, Dean Burgon, and Doctor Tragelles. It is, moreover, unreasonable to think that God in giving a written revelation to men mixed it in with a mass of mere human ideas, so that no one can tell what is God's Word and what is not. Such would be without authority to bind men's consciences, and could be but little better than no revelation. And it is the tendency among those who deny plenary, or full, inspiration to weaken concerning the authority of the Bible, accepting particular statements as truth only as they appeal to *their* reason. It leaves the Bible without authority in itself. If some parts of the Bible are not inspired, then who will tell us *which* parts are inspired? Of those who try it, no two can agree. Reason, therefore, requires that if we are at all to regard the

Bible as God's inspired Word, we must accept all parts of it as equally inspired.

But to affirm all parts of the Scriptures are equally inspired is not to say all parts are equally important in the sense that all parts have equal religious value. Doubtless the Sermon on the Mount or Paul's great charity chapter have a vastly higher religious significance than does the Book of Kings. The difference between these might be as great as the relative importance to a man of his hair and his brain. But as the life of the man's body is as truly in his hair as in his brain, so the Book of Kings is inspired as truly as is the Gospel of Matthew or the first epistle to the Corinthians. Neither does the equal inspiration of all parts of Scripture mean that God inspired the original utterance of the words of Satan and of wicked men therein recorded, such as, "Ye shall not surely die," or, "Crucify him." It is only the *recording* of these by the sacred penmen that is divinely inspired. The statement that the Scriptures are fully and equally inspired in all parts means the writers of the Scriptures were kept from error in their writing of God's message. But this does not mean they were made infallible at other times or that they had perfect knowledge of the subjects about which they wrote. Paul was enabled by God to write the first epistle to the Corinthians without error. But he was unable to remember which of the Corinthians he had baptized (1 Cor. 1:16). Moses wrote a true account of the creation of the universe, but this does not mean he had a full nor even a correct knowledge of the natural sciences. Only the inspiring Spirit is held to have had perfect knowledge and the human writers are here held to be inerrant only in their writing of the Scriptures, not at other times nor even at the time of their writing except in that writing.

That the Scriptures are divinely given is shown by such texts as 2 Tim. 3:16; 2 Pet. 1:21. That they were written by men is equally clear from many texts, such as John 1:17; Rom. 1:1; Gal. 6:11. God adapted his truth to ordinary human intelligence by shaping it in human molds. The Scriptures are a result of the interworking of the human and divine, not of one without the other. This divine inspiration of the sacred writers was not as an external force, acting upon them from without; but was from within and through their natural faculties, intel-

lect, and personality. From what we can gather from the Scriptural teaching and from personal experience today as to the manner of the working of God's Spirit, we are safe in believing that these writers retained full use of every human faculty, but that the Holy Spirit exalted the exercise of those natural powers, making use of them with "all the personal peculiarities of the writers, together with their defects of culture and literary style."—A. H. Strong. But these defects of diction are not such as affect the truthfulness of the Biblical statements. This is known as the dynamical or verbal-inspiration theory. But since both of these terms have been employed to denote the mechanical-dictation theory, they should be used with care.

Careful study of the Scriptures shows that divine inspiration affects both the thought and the words of the Scripture. "Yet it affected the words not directly and immediately by dictating them in the ears of the writers, but mediately, through working on their minds and producing there such vivid and clear ideas of thoughts and facts that the writers could find words fitted to their purpose."—Wm. Evans. As God, the Holy Spirit caused that thus God's message should be faithfully recorded; but as men, the writers wrote that message in language such as they would ordinarily use. Thus the Bible, though written by fallible men, is still an infallible guide as far as the original writings are concerned, because fully and divinely inspired.

II. Objections to Inspiration of Scripture from Alleged Errors

In these days of struggle between the destructive Bible criticism and orthodox Christianity, much is being said by religious liberalists about errors in the Scriptures. In a divine-human book like the Bible, we may expect difficulties. But with the many positive proofs of the divine inspiration of the Bible before us, we need not doubt its authorship merely because of these difficulties, which in many cases can be explained, and might be in every case if we had full knowledge of all the facts.

But the errors alleged of the Bible are not usually concerning its moral and religious teaching, which is the primary purpose of it, but of its secular teaching—its references to history and science—and in quotations. If the critics could actually prove that the original manuscripts of the Bible contain errors, it would not disprove divine inspiration, but would merely re-

quire many believers in inspiration to allow a larger place for the human element. However, many of the best Christian scholars, including Charles Hodge, a theologian of the highest order, have not found proof of the existence of real errors. Let us not be stampeded by the claims of errors and therefore decide such errors exist until we at least examine the alleged errors to see if there are any reasons for thus regarding them. The following are some of the alleged errors most commonly cited by the leading scholars of the liberal school. If it can be shown that these are not necessarily mistakes, but can as well be understood otherwise, then the Bible has not been convicted of error.

1. **Historical Errors.**—Though the Bible is not given for the purpose of recording ancient history, yet, inasmuch as truth has been historically revealed, it consists largely of history. Is it historically correct? In some cases it has been supposed to be incorrect; but discoveries have proved it to be correct and accepted historians to be wrong. The Bible record of a Hittite empire great enough to war with Egypt was affirmed by the ordinary historians to be incorrect, but later it was proved by inscriptions to be a true record. May we not suppose many other so-called errors of history in the Bible could be explained if we knew all the facts?

There may be some real errors due to mistakes of copyists, but not to any fault in the original manuscripts. Other apparent errors may be due to the use of round numbers rather than exact numbers, the general impression being considered more important than historical exactness, just as we say ten thousand men fell in a certain battle when but nine thousand and eight hundred died. The use of round numbers is intentional and is improperly called error. Varying accounts of the same events are also cited as error in history. These may often be accounted for in a perfectly satisfactory manner as resulting from the incompleteness of the records rather than as being error or contradiction. Each of the four evangelists gives the inscription on Jesus' cross, but no two of them give it alike. Yet none of them contradict any of the others. Each of them gives what he doubtless regarded as the essential part, and probably the sum of the four accounts is the total inscription. Matthew mentions two Gadarene demoniacs, but Mark mentions only one. Now if Mark had stated there was only one, then he would have contra-

dicted Matthew; but as it is, he does not contradict him, but merely describes the principal demoniac and leaves the account incomplete as regards the second. If such is error, then all single-volume general histories must be found to be full of errors when compared with an exhaustive history of the world.

2. **Scientific Errors.**—The Bible is concerned with science only as reference to it is of value in stating religious truth. And it may be confidently asserted that no discovery of science has shown one properly interpreted text of Scripture to be untrue. Doubtless the human writers did not have the advanced scientific knowledge of the present day; but is it not sufficient that the inspiring Spirit should have had this and so have guided them that their necessary references to scientific matters should be in such form that they should be understood by men of their own as well as of subsequent ages and yet not contradict scientific facts still to be learned by men?

The Scriptural reference to the "four corners of the earth" was doubtless understood by the ancients as referring to a flat earth; but the idea intended is merely the four points of the compass, and the expression was a popular one used only to express the idea of entirety, in language that unscientific men of all ages could understand. The assumption was that honest men with correct scientific knowledge would readily understand that it was necessary that the inspiring Spirit should thus state it if his religious message was to be accepted. This also explains the statement that the sun stood still. Such a statement by God's Spirit is no more incorrect than the reference to sunrise and sunset now used even by learned men of science. It is truth in popular form. So also the Bible record of creation may be fairly interpreted in harmony with all the proved facts of geology, astronomy, and other sciences, and it even need not necessarily be understood as contradicting such unproved hypotheses as the nebular theory. Much objection has been raised to the low antiquity for man that is gathered from the Bible genealogies. But this difficulty is more apparent than real. First, the Bible does not state what is the age of man; nor does it say there are no missing links in its genealogies since Adam, but rather implies that there may be. The Bible record may allow ten thousand years for man on earth. And some very reliable scientists claim no greater antiquity for man. But the mere fact that some scien-

tists claim an age for man on earth all the way from ten thousand years to five million years is reason for believing they do not have any very exact data from which to judge the correctness of the Bible.

3. **Moral Errors.**—Rash critics of the Bible sometimes make the statement that it contains so much of an immoral nature that it is unworthy of being read by children or pure-minded adults. They err in overlooking the fact that the Bible holds up the highest standard of morals known. The description of immoral conduct is often given that such conduct may be condemned, as in the case of David's sin with Bathsheba. Other immoral acts such as Jael's killing of the sleeping Sisera are merely recorded for another purpose without approving or disapproving them as to their moral quality. Still other conduct must be regarded as that of good men and relatively right according to their standard of morals at a time when the high moral standards of the New Testament were not yet given, as Abraham's having a second wife, or concubine, Hagar, yet being perfect according to the standard of morals in his day. Other events such as the exterminations by the Israelites at God's command are just on the ground of God's righteous sovereignty, as he is the judge of all the earth and properly punishes those who deserve it even through another nation of that age. Again, the mistake is made of judging people of ancient times and in Oriental countries by our modern Western standards of modesty and propriety. People of the highest purity of mind and moral standard in Eastern lands now, as in the past, speak freely in mixed company of matters considered by us improper for such mention. Here the claim of error in morality in the Bible is entirely unwarranted.

But probably the most common claim of error is concerning the imprecatory Psalms. We refer to an example of these which Dr. Sheldon says are not inspired, but the expression of "hot human passion." "Break their teeth, O God, in their mouth" (Psa. 58:6). But to begin, we may allow in most of the imprecatory Psalms, as authorities tell us, that the tense in the Hebrew is future and not imperative. Then they are predictions and not imprecations—an announcement of God's just judgments and not a prayer for them. Again, the error is made by the critic of taking symbol for literal fact. The breaking-out of the great teeth of the young lions described in the remainder of the

verse, is a symbol of making the wicked harmless. That these so-called imprecatory Psalms are divinely inspired and are to be interpreted as predictions is proved by Peter's interpretation (Acts 1:20) of Psa. 69:18-25. This scripture he interprets as being a prediction of Judas Iscariot, expressly stating that it was spoken by the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David (Acts 1:16). Who has the right to say it is a mere human utterance, or the expression of human passion, in the face of this positive statement of Scripture?

4. **Contradictions.**—"The Bible is full of contradictions" is a very common statement, usually made by men who are much better acquainted with the writings of the skeptic or higher critic than with the Bible itself. But as one better-informed critic has allowed, if we knew all the facts we might find that no real contradiction exists. So learned a writer as H. C. Sheldon has supposed he finds contradictions by comparing Deut. 10:1-5 with Exod. 37:1-9. In the first reference, Moses said he made the ark of the covenant, and in the second that Bezaleel made it. But may not Moses have meant that Bezaleel made it under his direction, just as the Panama Canal was made by Colonel Goethals, merely as he directed others in the construction of that great modern feat of engineering? Moses was the designer and superintendent, and Bezaleel the carpenter.

But why prolong the discussion? The foregoing considerations sufficiently show that many alleged errors are not such and that many others not mentioned may be explained. While we hold that even if the Bible were convicted of error in secular matters the inspiration of its religious message would not necessarily be affected, yet inasmuch as many able scholars have failed to find the proof of the existence of such error, why hasten to decide it exists? Until its existence is proved, why not suppose the divine element in the inspiration of the Scriptures has excluded error in the statement of facts both secular and religious?

Part III

NATURE AND WORKS OF GOD, OR THEOLOGY PROPER

Part III

NATURE AND WORKS OF GOD, OR THEOLOGY PROPER

Chapter I

THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

Having shown that God exists and that he has given a revelation of religious truth in the Scriptures, the next question for consideration both in importance and in logical order is, What is God? Our idea of the nature and operations of God is of fundamental importance. It determines what is the nature of our religion and theology. This is the point of divergence between polytheism, pantheism, and Christianity, between Unitarianism and Trinitarianism, and even in a degree between Calvanism and Arminianism. This study about the nature of God is the study of theology in the more restricted and exact sense of the term.

I. Possibility of Knowledge of God

1. **God as an Object of Knowledge.**—It is not possible to know that God is, without some knowledge as to what God is. In its very nature the first idea necessarily includes the second in a measure. The common convictions of mankind and the plain statements of the Scriptures give no uncertain testimony concerning God as an object of knowledge. It was predicted by the prophet that "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord" (Isa. 11:9). Also it was predicted "All shall know me" (Heb. 8:11). Even of the heathen it is said, they knew God, but did not like to retain that knowledge (Rom. 1:28).

There would be no need of any argument to show that God is knowable except for the sophistry of certain modern philosophers who attempt by their unsound reasoning to disprove a truth more certain than any of their premises. The argument as set forth at great length by Hamilton, Spencer, and Mill is in brief essentially as follows: The absolute is necessarily unknowable because knowledge requires a knower and a known, or relation, and the relative is opposed to the absolute. Also it allows God is infinite, but affirms he is therefore unknowable because

knowledge implies limitation and, it is said, limitation is contradictory to infinity. But the argument when reduced to simple language is nothing more than an affirmation that nothing can be known at all that can not be known exhaustively and perfectly. When the argument is thus stated, it is seen at once to be false. Most of the objects of which we have knowledge are knowable to us only in part. Self-knowledge is but partial. We can not know the mystery of our physical life, yet we know we have living bodies. We do not know what is thought, nor how the mind acts on the body, yet we know we have minds and we know we think. Even if we can not conceive exhaustively of the weight of the earth, yet we know certainly the earth is and somewhat of its properties and form. God is not only an object of faith, but also of knowledge.

2. **Extent of Men's Knowledge of God.**—An error opposite to the foregoing is that held by certain ancient as well as some modern philosophers, that God can be as fully known as any other object of knowledge. But these philosophers held pantheistic views of God and therefore self-knowledge with them is the knowledge of God.

Doubtless infinity in God excludes full knowledge of him by finite beings. Our knowledge of God can be only partial. He can not be conceived of in the sense of our forming a mental picture of him, but he is conceivable in the sense that he is thinkable. Also to affirm that God can be known by us is not to say that he can be comprehended in the sense that our understanding of him is perfect. If God could be fully known by our finite minds, he would be no god. We know that God has unlimited power to act, but how he does it we can not know. We know he knows all things, but concerning his mode of knowing we do not understand. We know his love is boundless, but here also our knowledge is limited. As we know space but not in its infinite extent, as we know duration though not eternity, so we know God really but not exhaustively.

3. **How God May Be Known.**—The mode by which we form an idea of God is the same as that we employ in forming our ideas concerning the facts of consciousness in our fellow men, which is by comparison with ourselves. We are the children of God. Therefore, in certain respects, we are like him and he is like us. It is proper that we should ascribe to him those

qualities of our own natures in an unlimited degree. Throughout his works in nature we see proofs that God has knowledge, emotion, volition. We know what these are in ourselves as rational beings and we rightly decide they are the same in God. To the idea of these qualities in ourselves we add the idea of infinity and thus have our idea of God.

Doubtless some would make the charge here that such a conception of God is anthropomorphic. In reply, first, is it not better to liken God to the highest we know, the human spirit, than to liken him to one of the lowest things we know, mere physical force, as is usually done by those who are shyest about anthropomorphism? This likening of God to the most exalted part of human nature, not to the physical part, we readily admit is anthropomorphism in the proper sense of the term, and we see no valid ground for objection either to such a mode of thinking of God or to the use of this term to describe such a conception, as do those who profess so great a horror for anthropomorphism. Men of all religions have always thought of God in this way. Also it is the principle which Paul assumed in addressing the Athenians. "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device" (Acts 17:29).

But we not only know God by our own natures, which are in his image, but we also know him through the revelation of himself in the Scriptures. With the proof of the divine authority of the Scriptures already given, we may now properly go to them as authority. And not only do we have the many statements of the Bible as to the nature of God, but we have there a description of Christ, who was God manifested in human form. This manifestation of God in the person of his Son is the surest of all methods of knowing God. It was truly said by Jesus, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Therefore God is not only an object of faith, but also of knowledge.

II. Nature and Classification of God's Attributes

God is known to us by his attributes, and any true definition of him must be in terms of his attributes. Doubtless an exhaustive definition of the infinite God is not possible to any finite creature. Yet it is possible for us to state what are those characteristics which differentiate him from all other beings.

Many definitions of God have been constructed, varying in form according to the purpose for which they were formulated, or according as particular aspects of his nature are made prominent. W. N. Clarke has given a definition of God that is very enlightening and excellent for the purpose intended, as follows: "God is the personal Spirit, perfectly good, who in holy love creates, sustains, and orders all" (Outlines of Christian Theology, p. 66). This definition has a practical end in view. It describes the nature of God's essence, exalts him above all others, and names the high motive that prompts all his works. It is simple, yet very comprehensive. But though it is practical, yet it fails to tell us certain things about God concerning which the mind seeks to know and which may be known. The definition given by the "Westminster Catechism," and which Dr. Hodge considers "propably the best definition of God ever penned by man," is as follows: "God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth." This definition is true and probably as complete as can be attained in a brief statement. It is to a great extent a mere naming of the divine attributes.

1. **Relation of God's Attributes to His Essence.**—The attributes of God are those characteristics which make him what he is, and which are essential to the idea of God and the ground for his various manifestations. Quality, property, and faculty are terms practically synonymous with attribute. However, in common usage they are not applied the same. Usually the qualities or characteristics of matter are called properties, those of mind faculties, and those of God attributes. We know matter by its properties, mind by its faculties, and God is known by his attributes. In no other way can matter, mind, or God be known, and nothing other than manifestations of these characteristics can be known of matter, mind, or God. Therefore to know God's attributes is to know God himself.

But it is improper to confound the divine attributes with the divine essence and with one another in such a sense that they have no distinct objective existence, but are mere human conceptions of God with no other basis than the imperfection of the finite mind. The attributes of God inhere in the divine essence. They are not mere manifestations existing apart from any essence. They are attributes or characteristics of God as weight or

extension are qualities of a material object. Attributes are inconceivable apart from that essence which is their basis. They belong to the essence of God as such, and are as inseparable from it as weight and temperature are from a material thing. They are to be distinguished from those relations of God not essential to his nature. Creation is not a divine attribute because God would still have been God if he had never created anything. The divine essence is manifested only through the attributes. Except for these God would be unknowable. Therefore to know God we must know his attributes.

2. **Classification of Attributes.**—Much learned labor has been expended in efforts to make scientific classifications of the divine attributes. Many methods of classification have been devised, but the great diversity of these methods is evidence that none of them has enough in its favor to give it general recognition. It is doubtful whether an exact scientific classification could add much to the understanding of the attributes. Order is the only purpose of classification, and the purpose of order is clearness. The classification here followed may lack in elaborate scientific arrangement sometimes sought, but it has the advantage of simplicity and is often followed. All the attributes are grouped in two classes in agreement with the two aspects of the divine nature—the metaphysical and the moral. The metaphysical are sometimes inaptly called natural attributes. At least seven divine characteristics belong to this class: (1) Unity, (2) spirituality, (3) immutability, (4) eternity, (5) omnipotence, (6) omnipresence, (7) omniscience. The moral or ethical attributes are not fewer than five: (1) holiness, (2) justice, (3) love, (4) mercy, (5) truth.

III. Metaphysical or Non-Ethical Attributes

1. **Unity of God.**—The term "unity" as here used is liable to be misunderstood or at least there is a danger of our grasping only a part of its significance, but probably for lack of a better term a definition of the one used is desirable. Unity is predicated of God in two senses. First, he is one to the exclusion of all others. Unity signifies his absolute solitariness in the rank of independent and original being. He is not one of a class, as is a man. He has no companion, as in dualism or polytheism. Second, he is not an aggregate or compound of separable units, as in Greek myths, but is simple being. Such oneness, however, is not

to be understood as excluding such interior distinctions as the various attributes, nor the threefold personality in that one divine indivisible essence.

The Scriptures clearly teach this unity. "The Lord he is God; there is none else beside him" (Deut. 4:35). "The Lord our God is one Lord" (Deut. 6:4). "I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God" (Isa. 44:6). "I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me" (Isa. 45:5). "There is one God" (1 Tim. 2:5). "There is none other God but one" (1 Cor. 8:4). These statements were uttered in opposition to the prevalent polytheism of the time when spoken and doubtless support the two aspects of divine unity aforementioned. Nature also affords abundant proof of divine unity. Amidst all the endless diversity of nature there is also a wonderful harmony. As science advances in the discovery of the laws of nature the harmony of nature is the more confirmed. In the cosmological argument for the divine existence it was shown that nature requires a first cause. As certainly as it points to the existence of a cause, it indicates that that cause is one.

The Bible affirms the unity of God. Also there is no logical need for allowing more than one God, and without a reason for supposing a plurality of gods the law of parcimony in logic excludes such a conclusion. Polytheism is not a product of reason, but as the apostle Paul implies in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, the result of a depravity so degraded that the creature is worshiped instead of the creator.

2. **Spirituality of God.**—By this expression is meant that God is a spirit, or that he is of spiritual substance. The theistic conception of God implies spirituality. Even idolaters usually do not think of their image as their God, but rather as a symbol or abode of a spirit which they worship. In some of their images is an opening to a cavity into which the spirit is supposed to enter.

When we affirm that God is a spirit we mean first, negatively, that he is not a material substance. He has no body, and none of the properties of matter can be properly predicated of him. Consequently he is not like a material being, with bulk, form, parts, or extension, but is invisible and intangible. Those Scripture statements which seem to represent him as having bodily parts, as eyes, ears, and hands, are anthropomor-

phic and are mere adaptations in language to represent knowledge attained or actions executed such as man accomplishes by the use of such organs. God appeared to Abraham and to Jacob in the form of a man, to Moses in the form of fire in a bush, to Israel as a pillar of cloud or fire, and as a bright light at other times. These manifestations which are technically known as theophanies are, however, not indicative of the essential nature of God, but are only forms assumed for the occasions.

Secondly, in attributing spirituality to God we mean positively that he possesses all those exalted qualities of a spirit which constitute personality. To ascribe spirituality to God is to exclude the idea of pantheism. To say that God is a spirit we imply: (1) that he is not a mere idea, but a real substance, though not a material one; (2) that he is an individual substance and not a mere principle or power; (3) that he has intellect, sensibility, and will, and therefore is a person; (4) that he possesses self-consciousness; and (5) that because he is a rational, voluntary being, he is also a moral being. We know what the qualities of spirit must be in God by what they are in our own spirits. And we know by our own consciousness that these are essential qualities of our own spirits.

The proof that God is a spirit is very explicit in the Scriptures. "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth" (John 4:24). He is "the Father of spirits" (Heb. 12:9). "The God of the spirits of all flesh" (Num. 16:22). "Now the Lord is that spirit" (2 Cor. 3:17). Rational evidence that God is a spirit is also not wanting. In all the theistic arguments we found proofs of free-will and personality which imply spirituality. Also spirituality in God necessarily results from ascribing to him infinite and absolute perfections. Matter is necessarily inferior to spirit because of those limitations and imperfections that belong to it.

When we affirm that God is a spirit we say that which we do not fully comprehend. Neither do we know what is matter. But as we can know somewhat of the nature of matter by its properties, so we know somewhat of spirit by its phenomena and by our own consciousness. And by our knowledge of what is the nature of the human spirit we arrive at a knowledge of what is the nature of the divine spirit. It is not important that we know what is the nature of the essence of spirit, but it

is important that we know what are the powers of spirits. This we know.

3. **Immutability of God.**—By this we mean God never changes as to his nature and attributes. He is necessarily unchangeable because he is perfect. Any changes must be for better or for worse. But a being who is perfect can not become better, and it is equally inconsistent to perfection to change to worse. Nothing could exist in a perfect being to cause him to change to worse and no cause outside of him could so effect him. God's perfections in an indefinite degree exclude the idea of any such thing as growth or evolution. That modern theological and philosophical theory that God grows is based upon the unscriptural and unreasonable idea that God is now imperfect and finite. But immutability in God should not be confused with immobility, nor interpreted in such a way as to antagonize the doctrine of divine personality. God is unchangeable in his essential nature, but he is capable of action. God is forever just. He rewards goodness, but if one whom he has been rewarding for goodness should cease to be good and should become evil the very immutable justice of God would require him to change his course of dealings with that person. Those representations in the Scriptures of God's "repenting" of that which he had done should be understood as anthropomorphisms. They merely describe a change in his course of action, in conformity with his unchangeable attributes, as a result of a change in the moral character of those persons concerned. But for the righteous his goodness is always the same.

The Bible clearly teaches that God is unchangeable. "I am the Lord, I change not" (Mal. 3:6). "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning" (Jas. 1:17). He is "the same yesterday, and today, and forever" (Heb. 13:8). The immutability of God is a truth of reason. Because he is infinite in all perfection nothing can be added to him nor taken away from him.

4. **Eternity of God.**—Eternity is infinite duration. Time is limited duration. By the eternity of God is meant that his existence is without beginning and without end. But more than mere infinite duration is involved in the eternity of God. It is his nature to exist, and necessary existence is involved in the

very idea of his being God. The supposition that at some time in infinite duration God did not exist is self-contradictory. Our finite minds utterly fail to grasp the full significance of the eternity of God's being, but reason will not admit of its denial. To reject it is to accept the unthinkable theory that all things originated out of nothing, or that all that is, including God himself, will be utterly annihilated.

Because God is immutable and possesses perfect knowledge of the past, present, and future, then experience of time must be foreign to him. Subjectively God is timeless. But the divine eternity in connection with God's infinite knowledge must be considered in another aspect. Doubtless in relation to the temporal order in the world which he has created, God knows things in succession. Here his knowledge is not determined by what he is in himself, but by his relation to the world. Infinite knowledge requires that his knowledge of events be not only immediate and complete, but also that he know succession as men know it. Without such knowledge a gradual revelation of truth in logical order would have been impossible.

The eternity of God is often affirmed in the Bible. The very name "Jehovah" which God gave to himself and by which he is commonly called means "I am" or the eternal living one. "I am hath sent me unto you" (Exod. 3:14). "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God" (Psa. 90:2) He is "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity" (Isa. 57:15). He is "the King eternal" (1 Tim. 1:17). In the cosmological argument for the existence of God is rational proof that God is eternal. Whatever dependent causes are to be found in nature, the mind requires an independent first cause and that cause must be personal as a free cause and eternal as an uncaused cause, else there was an uncaused beginning. But neither an uncaused beginning nor an infinite series of dependent causes are thinkable or possible.

5. **Omnipotence of God.**—By omnipotence is meant the almightiness or unlimited power of God, or that God has power to do all things which are objects of power. We get our idea of power from our own consciousness. We are conscious of originating effects by our own wills. There is that in ourselves which causes other things to be, and we call it power. In us power is

confined to narrow limits. Most of the effects we produce are by the use of means. We can not will a book into existence, but can cause one to exist by the use of means. This limited causal efficiency in ourselves as we know it in consciousness furnishes us an idea of the nature of that infinite causal efficiency in God. When from our idea of power as it exists in us all the limitations are removed, we have an idea of that unlimited power of God. We must employ means to effect results, but God wills and it is done. We may lack the means to do all that we will, but God, whose efficiency is independent of means, has no such limitations.

But it is erroneous to assume that God can do all things. Some things are not objects of power nor doable in their nature. The Bible states that God can not lie. God's power is not irresponsible or separate from his other attributes, but is limited by the perfections of his character. His nature is self-consistent. He can not do that which is contradictory. He can not cause a thing both to be and not to be at the same time. He can not make an old man in a minute, because such an idea is contradictory. He can not do the irrational. He can not make a world where three plus three will equal seven, or where the angles of a triangle will not be equal to two right angles. Neither can he do that which is morally wrong, because of the holiness of his own character. It is physically and naturally possible that God should do evil, but morally impossible, because he will not. God can not lie, neither can he cause it to be well with the wicked while they continue in wickedness.

Another important fact concerning omnipotence is that it does not imply that God exercises all his power. He has power to control the exercise of his power according to his holy character and wise purposes. If it is not so he is the slave of his own power and not omnipotent. He can do all he wills to do, but will not do all he can do.

The Bible says, "I am the Almighty God" (Gen. 17:1). "There is nothing too hard for thee" (Jer. 32:17). "With God all things are possible" (Matt. 19:26). "The Lord God omnipotent reigneth" (Rev. 19:6). As first cause or creator of all things his power must exceed every other power. Probably logical proof can not be given that God is more than most powerful, but rational evidence that his power is greater than

all other powers combined, is practically equivalent to evidence that he is all powerful. The fact that he is necessarily infinite in other attributes is ground for affirming also omnipotence of him.

6. **Omnipresence of God.**—By this is meant that in some sense God is everywhere and fills infinite space with his presence. We may be sure of the fact of his omnipresence, but the sense in which it is true is a subject very difficult for thought. Such infinity of God in relation to space is doubtless as difficult for comprehension by finite minds as is any other infinite idea. Certainly we are not to regard God as omnipresent in the sense of an infinite multiplication of his spirit because his spirit is necessarily one and individual as was shown under the unity of God. Neither is it proper to suppose it is by an extension of his parts or by diffusion of his essence throughout infinite space as the air is diffused over the surface of the earth. Since God is a spirit it can not be correctly said that a part of God is here and another part is there. Negatively this much can be said with certainty.

Both the Scriptures and reason furnish ground for believing God is everywhere present in his range of knowledge and action. There is no doubt that he is omnipresent in his ability to know and to do. But the most difficult question in relation to the subject is, Is he omnipresent in the sense that his essence is everywhere in its entirety always? Such a view has been not uncommonly held, and this essential omnipresence has been regarded as action. But it is not clear that such a sense of omnipresence is necessary to universal knowledge and action, and to many careful thinkers there seems to be no conclusive proof of an omnipresence of God's essence. Whether God is essentially omnipresent or not, it is certain that he is potentially so. On this point Dr. Sheldon has said, "Being is defined by the modes and the measure of its activity. As was observed in another connection, greatness depends, not on space filling bulk, but on range of action possible or actual. Now God is the one agent whose range of action is unlimited. This is the meaning of his omnipresence. He is present to all things as acting immediately upon all things. What makes distance to us is the limitation of our power of immediate action. For God no such limitation exists. One thing therefore is just as near to him as another, or, to say the same thing in

different terms, he is equally present to all things'' (System of Christian Doctrine, pp. 170, 171).

That sublime utterance of the Psalmist about God's omnipresence well represents the Scripture teaching on the subject. ''Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me'' (Psa. 139:7-10). ''Am I a God at hand, saith the Lord, and not a God afar off? Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the Lord. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord'' (Jer. 23:23, 24). ''For in him we live, and move, and have our being'' (Acts 17:28). Such are the clear statements of Scripture concerning God's omnipresence. Reason also teaches that the God who creates, sustains, and orders all must necessarily be everywhere present. Unless he is thus ubiquitous he can not be God in the true sense.

7. **Omniscience of God.**—With the proof that God is eternal and omnipresent, that he inhabits eternity and fills immensity, it logically follows that he is in possession of all knowledge. The fact of omniscience is inseparable from the omnipresence and eternity of God. Since his presence extends to all duration and all space, he must have immediate and complete knowledge. This is omniscience. Omniscience includes a perfect knowledge of all existences or events in the past, present, or future—actual and possible. That the range of God's knowledge includes foreknowledge, or prescience, is evident, not only from the foregoing reasoning concerning his eternity and ubiquity, but also (1) from his knowledge of himself which is the source and cause of all other existences and events, (2) from the fact of his prediction in the Bible of future events, and (3) from the general truth of his infinity.

Omniscience is incomprehensible to finite minds as are all other infinite ideas. Especially is the idea of any real prescience beyond the grasp of men's minds, since they have no experience of such a thing. But the chief difficulty in prescience is met with in the attempt to harmonize divine foreknowledge of men's acts with the doctrine of their free-will and moral responsibility. It is reasoned that if the future actions of men are foreknown

they must necessarily be predetermined, or made certain, and if they are predetermined they are no longer free acts, and if not free acts men are not morally responsible. But it is further argued that freedom and moral responsibility are among the most certain facts of consciousness and therefore must be true. It is consequently assumed that certain knowledge of future contingencies is not possible. But such a conclusion is contradictory to the fact that the Bible contains many predictions of future events in which the human element and men's free-wills are as surely concerned as in any event. Since these facts of consciousness and the truth of prophecy are both actual and certain, then they are not contradictory nor exclusive of each other as has been sometimes reasoned. Such reasoning is unsound, because it fails to make an important distinction between certainty and necessity. Knowledge is not causation, and foreknowledge is not predetermination. To affirm an event *will be* is not to affirm it *must be*. Both affirmations denote the certainty of the event, but *will be* implies that the opposite is possible while *must be* states that the opposite is not possible. God's foreknowledge of an event is due to the certainty of that event, but the event does not come to pass because God foreknows it. God foreknew the awful carnage of the World War and the fact that Christ would be crucified, but who will dare to say that his prescience caused either? God may know that an event *will be* and yet know that it *may not be* or need not be.

Another difficulty in the doctrine of divine prescience is his offers of grace and use of means for the salvation of particular men when he foreknows they will always reject his offered mercy. It is apparently true on the ground of God's prescience that God does seek to save those he knows will not be saved. There would be no reason for his dealing differently toward them if he knew they would be saved. If such procedure excludes divine prescience then prescience disqualifies God as moral ruler, for the only alternative course of dealing with the wicked would be for God merely to allot destinies to men on the ground of what he foresees they would choose if placed on probation. Such a course would exclude moral government. But moral government is a fact and necessary to men's highest good, and the moral ruler instead of being disqualified by prescience would be unqualified without it. No one could properly be trusted with the des-

tinies of all men unless he absolutely knew the future. Prescience is not inconsistent with the use of means by God for our salvation exactly as if he did not foreknow our final choice and destiny.

A similar objection to divine foreknowledge is that it is inconsistent with the goodness of God for him to create human souls that he foreknows will do wickedly and finally be lost. But the denial of prescience to God would not obviate the difficulty. Even if God's knowledge were as limited as ours, he would know that to create a race of beings with free-will and moral responsibility would make possible their final penal doom. Therefore the objection concerns not God's prescience, but his goodness. It is the problem of theodicy, one of the most difficult in theology. Probably this is one of the ways of the Lord that are "past finding out."

As we have defined omniscience it includes prescience, not only of all events actual, but also possible; not only of what *will be,* but what *can be.* There are difficulties in this view. It is to affirm that God knows an inconceivable amount more as possible than as actual. It means that God knows what would have been the future history of the world if the World War or any other decisive war had resulted oppositely, what different conditions would have been if our foreparents in Eden had not yielded to temptation or if the unnumbered free choices of men had been different, or what free wills would have done under different conditions, or what free wills that never existed would have done if they had been created. The difficulty here is principally the difficulty of infinity which is beyond our comprehension. But a greater difficulty confronts us if we disallow to God a foreknowledge of the possible as well as of the actual. It would be to deny to him practical omniscience. He could know his universe only as it is and could not understand its possibilities. He could not intelligently choose its course, because he would know only the consequences of but the one course. In fact, it would exclude his intelligent direction of the universe and the theory of existence attending such a belief would not be essentially different from fatalism.

The divine omniscience is clearly stated in the Scriptures. "The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good" (Prov. 15:3). "Great is our Lord, and of great

power: His understanding is infinite'' (Psa. 147:5). The truth in either of these texts concerning omnipresence complements that in the other. No portion of Scripture more fully describes God's omniscience than the first twelve verses of the one hundred and thirty-ninth Psalm, a part of which was quoted in proof of omnipresence. ''Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do'' (Heb. 4:13). If all things are opened to his view he must be infinite in knowledge, and that must include foreknowledge. ''New things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them'' (Isa. 42:9). The latter text clearly implies foreknowledge. The same is necessarily implied in every prediction of the Bible. A few texts that should be understood as anthropomorphic in their nature seem at first to represent God as not omniscient, but as a whole the Bible clearly teaches that he is.

Divine omniscience is of vital importance to religion. It is only on the ground of God's omniscience in its fullest sense, including prescience, that we can implicitly trust his providence, and feel assured that he will direct us aright. If he did not know all things, then he would not be worthy to be trusted with the eternal welfare of our souls, and those trustful relations with him that now bring us such deep peace would not be possible. The marvelous adjustments of nature, the vast reach of the laws of nature, the many marks of wise design, and especially the human mind with its capacity for indefinite improvement all point to a source whose knowledge is infinite.

IV. Moral Attributes

Our inquiry concerning the nature of God now leads us from the non-ethical attributes which are especially modes of activity to those attributes which represent qualities of character, or the moral characteristics of God. Contemplation of the natural attributes of God fills a devout person with awe, but when he meditates on the moral attributes his soul is bowed down with reverence and his heart glows with love for God.

In the anthropological argument for the existence of God it was shown that because man has a moral nature and that the moral can not come out of the non-moral, therefore his maker must be a moral being. Unless God has a moral nature no ration-

al account can be given of such qualities in man. But it is certain man has, implanted deeply in his nature, feelings of moral obligation and a sense of ought and ought not in respect to moral duties. Proof of a moral nature in God is evident, not only from man's inner consciousness, but also from the experience of society as a whole. It is true that when the experience of society is viewed at short range, it often appears that the affairs of men are not under the control of an overruling moral intelligence. Evil seems to prevail over the good, wicked men prosper and spread themselves "like the green bay-tree," the righteous are afflicted undeservingly, and as is doubtless needed for the moral excellence of men, it appears that no guiding hand of a good God rules the world. But the larger perspective afforded by history and society in its broader aspect is evidence to the contrary. To whatever degree nations or communities have become corrupted morally, destruction has threatened them. Nature and history afford indications of a moral ruler of the world, but the Christian consciousness has no question here. To it no truth is more certain.

Under the general classification of the moral attributes long lists have been given. But many of these attributes are comprehended in others. The present tendency is to reduce the number of them to include only the more comprehensive ones. The moral attributes are sometimes reduced to two—holiness and love. And doubtless all important moral qualities of God may be comprehended under these terms. Some persons would include all under one designation—holy love or loving righteousness. But properly to emphasize the more important aspects of God's character for practical purposes we will consider God's moral nature under five attributes.

1. **Holiness.**—Throughout the Bible both in the Old Testament and in the New the assertion is continually made that God is holy. Representative texts are as follows: "Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like thee, glorious in holiness . . . ? (Exod. 15:11). "I am the Lord your God: . . . I am holy" (Lev. 11:44). "But thou art holy, O thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel" (Psa. 22:3). "Holy and reverend is his name" (Psa. 111:9). In Isaiah's vision the seraphims cried, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts" (Isa. 6:3). "But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all

manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy" (1 Peter 1:15, 16).

Holiness means conformity to law in its broader and more common usage, and is often used synonymously with righteousness. It is most generally used of character, but it may be used with reference to conduct. A man whose character and conduct are especially in harmony with the law of God is said to be holy. But God is anterior to and superior to all law. Therefore the question may well be asked, "Can the holiness of God be defined in the above sense?" In reply it may be stated that for practical purposes it is sufficient to say that a thing is right because God wills it so, and another thing is wrong because God has forbidden it. Yet thoughtful minds must perceive at once that right is not constituted such by God's merely willing it so. It is right in its very nature, and he wills it because it is right. It is not conceivable that God should will that men hate each other, but he does will that they love each other. He wills it because it is right that they should love each other. There are unchangeable principles in ethics and religion as there are in mathematics. It is as unthinkable that these ethical principles should be otherwise as that two plus two should equal five. Therefore God is holy, not in the sense that he conforms to a law enacted over him, but in that he is perfectly conformed both in character and actions to eternal principles of righteousness. It is his very nature to be in such perfect harmony with that which is right, to approve that which is virtuous and to condemn and disapprove the impure.

But a more practical idea of the holiness of God is possible if viewed with regard to its different aspects. It has been described as having three elements. First, God is holy in the sense that his inner character is one of perfect goodness. This perfect goodness in God is the sum and result of all his moral excellences very much as is like goodness in a man in a lesser degree. An essential of God's holiness is his possession of all moral qualities in a perfect degree. The second sense in which God is holy is that his actions are always perfectly holy in consistency with the perfect holiness of his inner character. He never acts contrary to his character; therefore he acts always in conformity with principles of righteousness. Men can sometimes maintain right conduct only by acting in opposition to inner impulses and char-

acter, but God always acts freely. His holy inner character not only determines his holy conduct, but furnishes the inspiration for it. Though it is possible for God to do evil in the sense that he has free-will and power, yet it is morally impossible because it is absolutely inconsistent with his perfect holiness of character.

A third element in God's holiness is that he makes that inner moral excellence of his own character which determines his own conduct the standard for the conduct of his creatures also. He requires men to act as he acts. "As he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy, for I am holy." He could not be consistent with his own character nor true to his own perfect goodness if he required anything less from his moral creatures than conformity to those same principles of right that are the standard of his own actions. God's purpose in creating men was that they might glorify him by being holy, and his own holiness and self-consistency is the ground for demanding holiness in them. Neither does he demand of them the impossible. His method of producing holiness in the conduct of men is the same as that by which it exists in his own conduct. He provides for depraved men holiness of character through the work of salvation. The truly sanctified man is holy in his conduct in conformity to the holiness of his character. The practical aspect of God's holiness then is in providing a standard for holiness in men.

Because of his infinite goodness of character God must forever approve that which is good and disapprove the evil with an infinite intensity. His infinite holiness will ever be the condemnation and terror of the wicked and the loving admiration of the righteous, who will always feel it is appropriate to worship him as in the words of inspiration. "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory."

2. **Justice.**—That God is just is frequently affirmed in the Scriptures. "All his ways are judgment: A God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he" (Deut. 32:4). "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne: mercy and truth shall go before thy face" (Psa. 89:14). "There is no God else beside me; a just God and a Savior" (Isa. 45:21). "Just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints" (Rev. 15:3).

Divine justice as here used means that attribute in God's nature which causes him to render to all men what they deserve of

either reward or punishment. It is a form of the divine holiness and is often described as righteousness. To affirm that God is just or righteous is to say that he will certainly do what, and only what, ought to be done. He will be absolutely fair to all. In the popular thought of this divine attribute of justice, it is too often regarded as merely a disposition in God to inflict penalty for sin. But justice in God is much more than the certainty of punishment for sin. It does insure this, but also much more. It insures the right degree of both reward and punishment. God will punish the wicked, but no more than they merit, and he will reward the righteous as much as they deserve. He will be perfectly fair to all men, both good and evil. He sees, not only the evil, but also the good that men do.

The perfect holiness of God's own nature and those eternal principles of right by which he is guided require that he reward righteousness among his creatures, and also that he feel displeasure toward and punish those who disobey his precepts. All his creatures owe to him as their creator absolute obedience and subjection. The moral universe is constructed and conducted in conformity with holiness. To sin is to go against this law of the universe, and to those who do so the consequence is inevitable. The infliction of punishment either as to the fact or degree of it is not done arbitrarily by God. Right requires that God do it and he would not do right if he did not do it.

Because we are made in the image of God, we may properly judge what is the nature of the attribute of justice in God, by comparing with it the sense of justice possessed by men. In men this sense of justice is a state of the sensibility or feelings that results from the presentation to the mind of those facts that have to do with those concerned. This sense is of the same class of mental states as the sense of the beautiful, or of the fit. Such a sense of justice exists in all men. We intuitively feel when a fellow man does a good and noble act of self-sacrifice that he should be rewarded, and if one commits a foul crime in purposely doing a great injury to a helpless person we feel he deserves to be punished. As all possess this sense of justice so it is alike in its requirements in all, when all understand the object of justice alike. It is true that to one person an act may appear to deserve punishment while to another it merits reward, but this difference in judgment is due to lack of full knowledge of the facts on

the part of one or both concerning the said act. But when facts are apprehended alike by all men their sense of justice will agree as to deserts. Because principles of truth and justice are always the same, this sense of justice must be the same in God as in man, except because his knowledge is perfect his justice must also be so. Our method of knowing divine justice is anthropopathic, but it were vain to tell us we can not thus know what is just in God.

But what is the purpose of God's infliction of penalty for sin? Among men wrong-doing is punished with more than one end in view. Civil government and law exist for the public welfare, for the protection of the weak against the strong. But government is only efficient to the extent that its laws are respected and obeyed. Therefore, those who violate the law are punished that others may be deterred from doing likewise. But if punishment of the law-breaker is merely for the purpose of upholding the dignity of the law that others may be happy, then he suffers solely for the advantage of others, and the infliction of suffering in such a case would be unjust. If one does not deserve to suffer, justice forbids the infliction of suffering upon him. Therefore administrative justice must have a basis in retributive justice. The thief can not be justly imprisoned solely to deter others from stealing, nor to prevent his stealing more. The only proper ground for punishment of the thief is that he deserves to suffer. In cases of very flagrant crime a whole community rises up and demands that the perpetrator be punished. They may not stop to consider the beneficial effects of such punishment on their government, nor the possibility of the criminal's being reformed by the penalty. Neither is their demand necessarily prompted by hot anger. They are moved by an outraged sense of justice. They intuitively feel it is right and fitting that he should be punished. And doubtless such is the principal reason why God inflicts punishment on sinners—because they deserve it and it is right and fitting that it be meted out to them. God's purpose then in administering punishment is primarily as retribution, but it is also for the vindication of his law and moral government.

3. **Love.**—No truth is more clearly stated in the Bible than that love is a characteristic of God. Some of the most exalted utterances of divine inspiration set forth this truth. An example is the great word of the apostle John "God is love" (1 John

4:8). By this expression is meant that love is God's abiding quality or characteristic. It is not a temporary disposition, but it is his essential nature to love. Another text of equal significance is, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son" (John 3:16). "And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him" (1 John 4:16). "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8). These are sufficient Scriptural proof that love is a divine attribute. The next point for inquiry is concerning the nature of love in God.

Love may be defined as an emotion that causes one to crave the presence or possession of the object loved and to desire to promote the welfare of that object. In the light of such a definition a twofold aspect of love is evident—the desire to possess the object and the desire to benefit it. From two sources we may obtain help in understanding what love is in God. First we may learn what it is by comparing it with love as it exists among men who are created in his image. The second source is that grand example of the love of God that was exhibited in Christ.

Love as exhibited in human life is both a craving for and a living for its object. Both of these elements always exist in love, but in varying proportions. In its lowest form love is largely a selfish craving for its object. In its more exalted manifestation this selfish disposition is largely, but not entirely, lost in a desire to benefit the object loved. The noblest form of human love, that which exists in the mother for her child, has a large degree of this unselfish element in it. Her love moves her to much service and self-sacrifice for its well-being, even sometimes to the laying down of her own life. And yet though her love is so self-forgetful, it desires reciprocation. This craving to be loved in return by the one loved is an essential and inextinguishable part of love. Judging then from what we know of love as it exists in us, we conclude that love in God must contain in perfectly balanced proportions these two impulses. He desires first to give himself for the good of those he loves, and secondly he desires that they respond by loving him and giving themselves to him in return. In a being of perfect goodness as is God no attribute can be more desirable and helpful to others than holy love.

Also the manifestation of God's love in Christ and his work

agrees with our definition of love in its double aspect. God so loved the world that he gave his Son, which was in reality a giving of himself. God gave his best for men. Jesus gave his life for them. But this is not all of the expression of God's love in Christ. He is likened to a shepherd who goes out at great self-sacrifice to find his lost sheep. He would not only help, but also possess the object of his love. Christ expresses the love of God as a self-giving for men's well-being and a desire that they give themselves to him in return. Therefore love in God is of the same nature as love in us, but perfect in degree.

But love in its highest form does not necessarily imply approval of its object, as is often wrongly assumed. Such is not true of the highest type of love as we know it among mankind. How often the love of good parents continues to follow a wayward child even though they strongly disapprove of the child's conduct. A godly mother may loathe the vile sins of a wicked son, but in spite of his vileness she loves him with a love that never wavers. She desires, even at great personal loss to do him good and to turn him to righteousness. And such is the love of God. Therefore he loves sinners, and freely gives his best for their welfare. Even his perfect holiness does not exclude his loving sinners, nor is it in any way incompatible with such love, but rather holiness and love are necessary to each other. Without love God would not be holy, and without holiness he could not be love, and perfection in either one of these attributes requires perfection in the other.

That God is love is affirmed by the Scriptures and since they have been shown to be the Word of God we should believe it is true on that ground if there were no other reasons for believing it. But when we look about us and see how many benefits come to men to increase their happiness, when we consider that they might have much more misery than they now have, and when we see positive marks of a kind providence we are constrained to believe for these reasons also that God is good and loving. These things must not be forgotten. Nevertheless, insoluble perplexities present themselves when we attempt to reconcile with the idea that God is infinitely good and powerful the fact of the existence of evil in the world. In other words, if God possesses perfect goodness and infinite power why did he make evil possible? The opposer of theism supposes he has here a conclusive argument

in favor of his position. Theists may not be able to answer the question, but certainly the opposer has manifold more and greater difficulties in maintaining his theory.

Atheists, materialists, pantheists, and all other fatalists find no difficulty in this, the problem of theodicy, because they assume all things are as they are because they could not be otherwise. But theists must regard evil as being a contingency—that it might not have been. Evidently God does not compel men to sin, nor does he will that they do so. He might have prevented evil by refusing to create men or by creating them without the capacity to do evil. But to exclude the possibility of sin would have also excluded rewardable virtue. Then man could have had only automatic excellence and he would have been only an automaton, or not a free moral being. But the question again arises, how could an infinitely good God create a race of free moral beings when he evidently foreknew that many of them would sin and suffer the penalty of sin?

Various attempts have been made to answer the question. The universalist proposes final salvation for all. The optimist says all that is, is best. The annihilationist thinks to find a solution in annihilation of the wicked. Others have vainly attempted an answer by referring the origin of sin and evil to a previous existence, while Calvinists seek relief in the idea that sin is decreed by God and is a part of God's plan. Space forbids a full statement and refutation of these inadequate and unscriptural theories. It is sometimes said that God gave men the power to refrain from sinning and that therefore whatever evil comes upon them as a result of their own sin they deserve. It is held that eternal blessedness should be made possible to the race, even at the expense of future punishment to some who sin and therefore are justly punished as the result of their own choices. This view sufficiently vindicates the justice of God. But still the question remains, why did God make it possible that some should suffer in order that others might be blessed?

This is the real question of theodicy. Attempts have been made to show that existence under any conditions is a blessing and better than non-existence. If such could be shown to be true the problem would be solved, but such can not be certainly proved. Probably the problem of theodicy must remain for the present one of the inscrutable mysteries. Many such mysteries

must be admitted to exist in connection with known facts both in religion and science. In spite of this mystery concerning the existence of evil in God's universe mankind is possessed of an inalienable conviction that God is good. Men can not intelligently complain against God for giving them existence. Normally their joys vastly outweigh their sorrows. But sorrows do come. Yet men do not complain against God, because he has shown goodness at infinite self-sacrifice in providing a remedy. The existence of evil among men presents a dark picture, but there is light in the gospel of Christ. Everlasting happiness is made possible by God. And men can not avoid the conviction that God is good.

4. **Mercy.**—Mercy is love for the miserable. Being a form of love, it is sometimes included under the latter in treating of the attributes of God. But inasmuch as mercy has so large a place in Christian Revelation and in the relation of God to sinful men, it is not improper that Christian theology should give it separate treatment for emphasis. The condition of the object of love is that which gives love the character of mercy. Mercy is not only the disposition to treat, but also the act of treating, an offender less severely than in strict justice he deserves to be treated, especially when such lenience is the result of benevolence or compassion.

Various other terms closely related in meaning to mercy are pity, compassion, forbearance, long-suffering, clemency, grace, and pardon. Grace is favor shown to the undeserving. Pardon, forgiveness, or mercy is favor shown to those who justly deserve punishment. Pardon is mere remission of the outward penalty deserved by the offender, forgiveness is mere dismissal of the displeasure of the offended toward the offender, but mercy seeks the highest possible good of the offender. Mercy then in its fullest and broadest sense is worthy of Him who alone is love. No fact has greater significance for a world of sinners than that glorious truth that God is merciful. "His mercy endureth forever."

The truth of divine mercy is clear only in the light of revelation. Indications of divine goodness are abundant in nature, but violations of its law are punished inexorably. No mercy is found there. But the Bible is filled with affirmations that God is merciful. A few of them are sufficient. "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in

goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin'' (Exod. 34:6, 7). ''The Lord is long-suffering, and of great mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression'' (Num. 14:18). ''The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide: neither will he keep his anger forever. He hath not dealt with us after our sins; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his mercy toward them that fear him. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us. Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust'' (Psa. 103:8-14). Each of the twenty-six verses of the 136th Psalm ends with the statement of the great truth, ''His mercy endureth forever.''

Like love, mercy is evidently similar in God to what it is in us. It is not merely a form of thought with God, but it contains an emotional element. If it is not benevolent feeling in God, then it ceases to be mercy in a sense that gives a blessed assurance of help in time of need.

5. **Truth.**—The attribute of truth in God may well be considered under two aspects—veracity and fidelity. By veracity is meant that God is truthful in his statements. Because God is truth in this sense we may safely believe the statements of divine revelation. Veracity in God is a result of both absolute knowledge and of holy feeling. Unless he possesses unlimited knowledge we can not be certain that he always knows the truth, and therefore his statements may contain error. But the most important element in the divine veracity is his perfect moral character that results in holy feeling. This is that which is most highly esteemed among men as an assurance of their veracity. Veracity in God requires that his revelation be true, but not that it be all the truth. There is much truth, no doubt, which is beyond our grasp. The revelation of such would not only be useless, but would obscure the truth that otherwise could be understood. Neither does veracity require that a divine revelation be such that it be incapable of being misunderstood.

By affirming fidelity of God we mean that he is faithful. What he has promised he will perform. Human promises may fail of performance because unforeseen circumstances arise that

make fulfilment impossible, and also because in some instances the promises themselves are deceitfully given. But with God omnipotence guarantees the fulfilment of his promises as far as ability is concerned and his holiness gives assurance of his voluntary faithfulness. Men often fulfil their promises from no higher motive than for mere personal honor or conventional pride, but God's faithfulness is the result of holy sensibility and perfect moral character. Because of this his promises are sure. They can not fail, because God is true in an infinite degree. This is the ground of the Christian's unwavering trust in the fulfilment of God's promises.

Chapter II

THE DIVINE TRINITY

By the divine Trinity is meant the union of the three persons—Father, Son, and Spirit—in the one Godhead. The idea of a divine trinity is peculiar to the religion of the Bible. No non-Christian religion knows any such doctrine as that of Christian Trinitarianism. Polytheistic religions have often grouped their gods variously, and not infrequently this grouping has taken the form of triads. But such triads represent tritheism, being mere groups of divinities without historical connection seemingly, and evidently without similarity to the Christian idea of three persons in one Godhead. Such triads among heathen divinities have been sometimes suggested by the ancient conception of three divisions of the universe—heaven, the earth, and the underworld. An example of such a triad is that of the ancient polytheistic nature worship of Babylonia in which Amu is represented as the god who ruled in heaven, Bel on the earth, and Ea under the earth. Another cause for grouping in triads is the family idea or the idea of a god, his wife, and their child. Among non-Christian religions, the triad of Hinduism—Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva—is the nearest approach to the divine Trinity.

The doctrine of the Trinity is not only peculiar to Christianity, but it is also necessary to it. It is a great error to suppose this doctrine is a mere speculative truth of no practical value or interest to Christians generally. It is fundamental to Christianity. Christianity would cease to be Christianity without it. It is that which determines the nature of the religion of all true Christians as to inner belief and experience. Many Christians are doubtless unable clearly to state the doctrine, but nevertheless they believe it as to its various elements.

If there is no Trinity there is no divine Christ. If one believes Christ is not divine, consistency requires him also to believe that there is no adequate sacrificial atonement for sin, and that the atonement has no greater value than its moral influence. And if no adequate sacrifice for sin has been offered, pardon and regeneration as an instantaneous work of grace must be given up. In short, he must substitute salvation by works for salvation by faith. Belief in the doctrine of the Trinity is

that which distinguishes between an evangelic and a rationalistic religion. These are not only the logical consequences of anti-trinitarian belief, but the history of Unitarianism confirms such statements. Not only the older Socinianism, and the New England Unitarianism, but also the modern "liberal Christianity" rejects the divinity of Christ, and all unite in rejecting all the other doctrines before mentioned. With them salvation is by character and not by grace through faith. It is a mere natural process. The denial of the Trinity logically and actually leads to a faith essentially different from evangelic Christianity and an entirely different interpretation of the New Testament throughout. The doctrine of the Trinity is not useless as has been affirmed, but vitally important to Christianity. If it is not true, we are yet in our sins.

The truths of Christianity thus far considered are of such a nature that their truthfulness must be admitted on rational grounds. Now we approach a doctrine of pure revelation. But with the proof of the divine authority of the Scriptures already considered, we may properly accept their testimony as adequate reason for our belief of it. Though the doctrine of the Trinity may not be discovered by the reason, yet when it is revealed by Scriptures it is found to be, not contradictory to reason, but logically necessary to the Christian system.

I. The Doctrine of the Trinity

The truth of the divine Trinity, like other aspects of Christian doctrine, is not stated in the Bible in scientific form, but the elements of the doctrine are clearly stated there even though it appears to be done incidentally in many instances. The consideration of the subject involves questions of fact, and also questions of the harmony of the facts. And it should ever be borne in mind that the facts must stand even though they can not be harmonized satisfactorily to all minds. Our first aim should be to learn the Bible facts, and then seek to harmonize them. Even if an attempt to harmonize them results in no more than showing they are not contradictory, the doctrine may reasonably be accepted. Our aim then should be first to set forth the constituent elements of the doctrine as found in the Scriptures.

1. **Biblical Elements of the Doctrine.**—The first fact of the

Bible that is a constituent element of this doctrine is the unity of God. Whatever else the Bible may say, this fundamental truth must not be denied. Trinity must not be assumed to be tritheism. The Bible constantly affirms that God is one in that he has no equal or companion and also in that he is not compounded. This has been shown in discussing the divine attribute of unity. God's unity is a fundamental truth in the doctrine of the Trinity.

The second Bible fact that must be given consideration here is that divine attributes and titles are ascribed, not only to the Father but also to the Son and to the Holy Spirit. They are all alike represented to us as being God, equal in power and glory. But the terms Father, Son, and Spirit are not to be understood as mere distinctions in designating one being as a matter of emphasizing different relations of God to men. The Scriptures represent each of the three as saying I of himself. The Father addresses the Son with the pronoun "thou" (Heb. 1:9), the Son addresses the Father as "thou" (John 17:5), and they speak of the Holy Spirit as "he" and "him" (John 14:26). They act upon one another and are objects of one another's action. These facts point to three distinct persons who are God. But the fact is that their attributes are the same, and these are qualities of and inseparable from the divine substance; therefore the substance of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is the same. These then are the vital facts of the Scriptures from which the doctrine of the Trinity is constructed. God is one, yet in some sense he is three. He is one as to essence, but three as to personality. Fuller Scriptural proof of these facts will be given in the appropriate place, but these are the facts as clearly set forth in the Bible.

2. **The Doctrine in Early Church Symbols.**—Doubtless at a very early period in the church's history the foregoing truths of the Bible concerning God's threefold nature were held as they are by many devout Christians today as separate, distinct facts without any attempt being made to harmonize them. Such unquestioning faith was all right for practical purposes as long as conditions remained such in the church that a harmony of these truths was not needed. Soon, however, heresies arose which emphasized some of these facts to the exclusion of the others. Ebionites denied the divinity of Christ. Gnostics re-

garded him as a mere emanation from God, dependent, and not equal with God. Sabellians regarded the same person as at once Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit, these three names being used merely to express different relations of God to men. The Arians affirmed Christ is not eternal, but that he is the first and highest of all created beings.

It was the purpose of withstanding the evil influence of these heresies that the Christian doctrine of the Trinity gradually began to be formulated. Often great Christian truths have been held as objects of faith long before they have been set forth in doctrinal form and their various elements harmonized. Sometimes such formulation of doctrinal truths takes place only when it becomes necessary to offset opposing heresies. The conflict of the early church with the Arian heresy was especially fruitful in leading to the formulation of the Trinitarian doctrine. Because of the sharp contention between the opposing factions, the Emperor Constantine was moved to convene the First Ecumenical Council, which met at Nicæa, in Asia Minor, in the year 325 A. D. One of the objects of this council was to frame a statement of this Christian doctrine that would include all the Scriptural elements and harmonize with the religious convictions of Christians generally. Though creeds or statements of faith because humanly constructed have sometimes obscured rather than elucidated the Bible teaching, yet it must be allowed that the mature thought concerning the divinity of Christ of many such fearless defenders of the truth as Athanasius enabled them in framing this Nicene creed, or symbol, to state the doctrine of the Trinity with a degree of clearness that has seldom if ever been surpassed. The Nicene symbol as given by H. C. Sheldon in his History of Christian Doctrine is as follows:

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, begotten of the Father, the only begotten, that is, of the essence of the Father, God of God, and Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made, in heaven and earth; who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down and was incarnate, and was made man; He suffered, and the third day He rose again, ascended into heaven; from thence He cometh to

judge the quick and the dead. And [we believe] in the Holy Ghost. And those who say, there was a time when He [the Son] was not; and, He was not before He was made; and, He was made out of nothing, or out of another substance or thing, or the Son of God is created, or changeable or alterable—such the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church condemns."

Due to the fact that this statement of faith was formulated for the purpose of upholding the true divinity of Christ and not especially to affirm the fact of the Trinity, the result was deficiency in its statement concerning the Holy Ghost, of whom it merely affirms belief. Athanasius and others held this statement to imply belief in the Trinity, while their opposers denied that such a meaning was intended. The consequent confusion resulted in the calling of the Council of Constantinople in 381 A. D. That council amended the Nicene creed by adding an affirmation of the divinity and equality of the Holy Ghost with the Father and Son. But a still more definite statement of belief in the Trinity is that known as the Athanasian creed. It is of unknown authorship and not the product of a church council. Though it is not the formation of Athanasius, yet it is not improperly designated as it is, because it has had a vast influence in supporting the doctrine of the Trinity for which that heroic church father so earnestly contended. It is in part as follows:

"We worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance. For there is one Person of the Father; another of the Son; and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one; the Glory equal, the Majesty coeternal. . . . So the Father is God: the Son is God: and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet there are not three Gods: but one God. . . . The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone; not made, nor created: but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten: but proceeding. . . . And in this Trinity none is afore, or after another: none is greater, or less than another. But the whole three Persons are coeternal, and coequal. So that in all things, as aforesaid: the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worshiped."

This remarkable statement of belief in the divine Trinity

is regarded as being in harmony with and inclusive of all the vital elements of the Bible teaching on the subject, as well as representative of the faith of the church through the centuries. No later statements by theologians or church councils have succeeded in setting the doctrine in clearer light. "When we consider the incomprehensible nature of the Godhead, the mysterious character of the doctrine of the Trinity, the exceeding complexity and difficulty of the problem which the church had to solve in presenting the doctrine that there are three persons and one God, in such a manner as to meet the requirements of Scripture and the convictions of believers, and yet avoid all contradiction, we can hardly fail to refer the church creeds on this subject, which have for ages secured assent and consent, not to inspiration, strictly speaking, but to the special guidance of the Holy Spirit" (Charles Hodge—Systematic Theology, Vol. 1, p. 478).

3. **The Doctrine Stated.**—The foregoing ancient symbols consist of a careful statement of the different Scriptural elements of the Trinitarian doctrine set in proper relation to each other. But it is noticeable that they attempt only a formulation, not a philosophy, of the doctrine. They are objects for faith, but are not designed to satisfy the reason. Here the question may appropriately be asked, "Is a philosophy of the Trinity possible?" The care with which the ancient statements of the doctrine avoid attempting such a philosophy is evidence that their formulators doubted its possibility. Some later writers have endeavored to set forth a philosophical statement of the doctrine for the purpose of proving or illustrating it. But all attempts to reason out and illustrate that which is so evidently inconceivable are necessarily unsatisfactory. The intellect, sensibilities, and will in the soul of man have been much pointed to as illustrating trinity in God. They do show the possibility of a certain triplicity in unity, but such an illustration leads to the Sabellian rather than the true idea of the Trinity. We think no satisfactory philosophy of the Trinity is possible, because the idea is incomprehensible to men.

The doctrine may be stated, however, in such a manner that no fact of Scripture is omitted or contradicted. To do this it is necessary to avoid Unitarianism on the one extreme and tritheism on the other. God must be regarded as one being, yet

three as to person. To affirm both unity and trinity of God is not to say that he is one and yet three in the same sense. Such would be absurd and it is not supposable that millions of intelligent Christians believe an absurdity. In some sense he is one, in another sense he is three. Probably for practical purpose no better distinction can be made between these two senses than to say as is commonly said and as the church symbols affirm, that God is one as to substance, but three as to person. Such an idea is incomprehensible to us, but it has the practical advantage of showing that the Scriptural facts of unity and trinity in God are not irreconcilable nor contradictory to each other. The term "person" as used in relation to members of the Godhead is not to be understood as identical in meaning with its use in relation to men. But what man is competent to say that God can not subsist in a mode peculiar to himself which we can not comprehend because it is beyond the range of our experience?

With the fact established that the elements of the doctrine are not contradictory to each other, it is not unreasonable to believe them. Christian thought and faith may properly accept these truths of the Bible unquestioningly and without explication. This the devout heart does, and experiences in so doing the blessedness of believing.

4. **Mystery of the Trinity.**—The principal objection urged against the doctrine of the Trinity is that it is an incomprehensible mystery and therefore the Unitarian charges us with illiberality for requiring belief in it. It has already been shown that the doctrine does not involve an arithmetical absurdity nor a contradiction by affirming that God is three and yet one, for these are not affirmed of God in the same sense. Yet when this is said the opposer still makes the charge of illiberality against those who insist on belief in the truth of the Trinity. That the doctrine contains much mystery we readily admit, and if we insisted that men comprehend the idea exhaustively we should indeed be unreasonable in our requirements. But all that is required for acceptance of the doctrine is belief of the truth of the Trinity as it is stated in the Bible. And it is not necessary that all its mysteries be elucidated before we can believe it.

If we may properly believe only that which is free from mystery, then how narrow indeed must be the range of credible truth! Mystery is met on every hand in nature. We know

many facts through phenomena, yet do not understand the mysterious cause of their phenomena. That the mind controls the body is well known as a fact by consciousness, but what is the connection between the mind and the body is an inexplicable mystery. Science is well aware of the fact that gravitation operates in a marvelous manner in directing the course of the heavenly bodies, but what is that mysterious power and how it attracts is clothed in mystery. Mystery enshrouds many of the things we know most surely. We are familiar with the fact of physical life, but what it is we can not know. The common grain of wheat of which our daily bread is made contains within itself the mysterious power when planted in the ground to germinate and produce other similar grains of wheat. When we say God is a spirit we say what even Unitarians recognize as being a fact, but none of us know what is a spirit. It is incomprehensible to us even though we know it is true. Why, therefore, should we regard the truth of the Trinity as incredible simply because it is mysterious? With evidence that what the Bible says God says, and with clear statements there of the truth of the Trinity, it ought to be believed even though it is mysterious.

II. Bible Proofs of the Doctrine

In no place in the Scriptures does the word "trinity" occur. This has sometimes been regarded as an evidence that Trinitarian proofs are not to be found there. But it might as properly be reasoned that because the words "omniscience" or "omnipresence" do not occur there that therefore the Scriptures do not teach that God knows all things and is everywhere present; or that because "Decalog" and "Pentateuch" are not terms of the Bible therefore the Ten Commandments and five books of Moses are not to be found there. The absence of the term in the Bible is no evidence that the truth for which it stands is not found there under other terminology. Rather it is because the truth of the Trinity is taught there that theology has made use of this term so well adapted to the brief expression of that truth.

Also it is true that the Bible does not formulate or directly state the doctrine. Therefore it is not to be expected that in giving Bible proof of the doctrine any single passage may be given that adequately affirms Trinitarianism. The most cer-

tain proof is to be found in the vast multitude of texts that imply it by affirming the constituent elements of the doctrine —that God is one, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are distinct persons, and that each of them is divine. When these elements are shown to be contained in the Bible and are set in proper relation the doctrine of the Trinity is the result. The fuller exhibition of these elements will be given under other headings concerning Christ and the Holy Spirit. Here our purpose is to give only such passages as contain all the essential elements of the doctrine.

1. **The Baptismal Formula.**—"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 28:19). In this well-known injunction of Jesus the implication is clear, (1) that the Father, Son, and Spirit are distinct, because each one is named in the one passage; (2) that each is a person, because Christian baptism is to be in the name of each, which could be true only of persons; (3) that each is divine, because disciples can properly be baptized only in the name of the Divine Being. These facts also imply the equality of the three members of the Godhead. Whatever is implied here of the Father is also implied of the Holy Ghost. If "in the name of the Father" implies his personality, as much is implied of the Son and Spirit by the similar expressions concerning them. This passage has always been accepted by Christians generally as sufficient proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, and it certainly is worthy of much respect for critical thought. In this formula for baptism God has made provisions for this important truth to be kept constantly before the minds of the church as a fundamental truth of the faith.

2. **Paul's Benediction.**—"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen" (2 Cor. 13:14). In this prayer the apostle prays, (1) to Christ for his grace or favor to the Corinthians; (2) to the Father for his love to be extended to them; and (3) to the Holy Ghost for his communion, or fellowship. Here the divinity of each of the three is evident because such a prayer can properly be addressed only to God. The personality of each is clearly implied, for only persons can show favor, manifest love, or be objects for the fellowship of men. The dis-

tinction of the three is unmistakably implied in the wording of the text. Every repetition of this prayer is therefore a recognition of the divine Trinity.

3. **Other General Trinitarian Texts.**—Except for its probable ungenuineness, no text in the Bible would have greater value as proof of the Trinity than 1 John 5:7. "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." This statement is practically an affirmation of the doctrine of the Trinity, but its absence from all the ancient manuscripts but one, from all the early church fathers, and from all the ancient versions except the Vulgate has been considered sufficient reason for its omission from most of the later English translations. It is supposed by scholars to be an interpolation, probably having been originally a marginal note, which was brought into the text unwittingly by an ancient scribe. Whatever may be the real degree of its right to a place in the sacred text, its conspicuous absence in the ancient texts has so discredited its genuineness that it has no value in support of the doctrine and so may as well be dismissed from the consideration.

It was said by church fathers, "Go to the Jordan and you shall see the Trinity." On the occasion of Jesus' baptism the Father addressed the Son from heaven and the Holy Spirit descended upon him in the form of a dove (Matt. 3:16, 17). The least that can be said of this text is that it clearly distinguishes the three members of the Godhead. To most minds it is an important support of the Trinity. Certainly it is so if taken in connection with other texts. In Jesus' discourse to his disciples following the institution of the last supper, which is recorded in John 14, 15, 16, he tells them about the Father and addresses the Father, and promises to send to them the Holy Spirit, who will comfort, guide, and teach them. Jesus thus clearly recognizes the personality of all three and the works he ascribes to the Spirit, including showing "things to come" (John 16:13) clearly imply divinity and equality with the Father, and the Son.

Another text that distinguishes clearly, by naming them, the three members of the Godhead and implies the divinity of the Spirit by attributing to him eternity is as follows: "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit

offered himself without spot to God" (Heb. 9:14). Still other texts of similar value may be cited. "For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father" (Eph. 2:18). "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 1:2). If the three last texts cited do not reach the goal of full proof of the Trinity, they at least have value as partial evidence and are valid proof in connection with those texts that supply whatever they may lack.

A proof of the Trinity of a somewhat different nature is the Hebrew name for God, Elohim, which is the plural form. Some Trinitarians have questioned its value as such proof, and standing alone it probably would not be conclusive, but the argument from it is immensely strengthened by the fact that it is often used with the plural pronoun of the first person, as "Let *us* make man in *our* image." Such statements should doubtless be regarded as implying a truth not clearly revealed in the Old Testament, but which was later to be made known; much as some of the early predictions of Christ's salvation, such as the statement that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent, but dimly intimate that blessed truth so vividly foretold later by Isaiah. To many minds the foregoing proofs from the Bible are sufficient evidence of the truth of the doctrine under discussion, but it is well to remember that these are not the surest proofs of the Trinity; they are yet to be given.

III. The Divinity of Christ

That there is one God who is a person and that the Father is that one person is allowed by all theists. Proof of the divinity and personality of the Father is therefore superfluous here in support of the doctrine of the Trinity. All Unitarians admit these to be facts. Also the personality of Christ is generally admitted. That Christ is a person distinct from the Father has been shown and Unitarians usually recognize him as being so. The important and vital question concerning Christ in the Trinitarian discussion is concerning whether or not he is God in the highest sense of the term. The whole argument turns on this point. If it can be shown from the Scriptures that Christ is essentially divine and equal with the Father the real objection of Unitarians to the truth of the Trinity is answered. That

Christ was truly human was denied by the ancient Gnostics, but today almost all classes allow he was man. Unitarians deny and Trinitarians affirm he was also truly God. The truth must be determined by the words of Scripture. To exhibit and comment on all the Bible gives on the divinity of Christ would require much space. For the sake of brevity some of the more important Bible proofs are grouped under a few main heads.

1. **Divine Titles of Christ.**—One of the methods by which the Scriptures teach the divinity of Christ is by calling him by the various names of deity. Certain terms are commonly used in the Bible to denote the Divine Being and these are used of Christ in the same sense. Nothing can be more reasonable than to understand that his being called God implies that he is God.

(1) *Christ is called God.*—No more positive statement is possible than that found in the opening verses of John's Gospel. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him" (John 1:1-3). Here Christ not only is given the divine title "God," but the direct and positive affirmation is made that he is God. That the term "Word," or as it appears in the Greek, "Logos," is used to denote Christ is certain from verse fourteen, where it is said, "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." The opening words of the text affirm the preexistence and eternity of Christ. It does not state that in the beginning, which probably refers to the beginning of created things, the Logos began to be or was created, but it affirms that "in the beginning *was* the Word." He was already existing when time and creation began, because, as the text further states, "*All things* were made by him; and without him *was not anything* made that was made." This statement absolutely excludes the possibility of his having been created himself, by affirming that he made all that was made; and surely he could not have made himself, for he could not have acted before he existed. Therefore he is eternal, and because eternal, divine.

Unitarians have not been slow to see that this text if interpreted as it reads is fatal to their theory, and have therefore endeavored to interpret it to harmonize with their teaching. They contend that the omission in the original of the article

before the second use of the word "God" requires the indefinite article in the English translation. Then the text reads, "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with *the* God and the Word was *a* God." But the highest authorities in New Testament Greek state that usually if the article is used before both the subject and the predicate they are convertible and what is true of one is true of the other. Then if the inspired writer had thus repeated the article in this case he would teach the doctrine of the ancient Patripassians, that God and the Word were identical. But if he had done so then the last clause in the first verse would contradict the middle one that the Logos was *with* God, which implies that in some sense they were not identical. The preposition "*with*" implies a relation, which is not possible except there be more than one. Therefore the verse is in exact harmony with the idea of the divine Trinity. The Logos is both with God and yet is God. That he is God in the highest sense is clear from the statements that he is both eternal and creator. The insertion of the article in question would have made this text contradictory, not only to itself, but to the idea of the Trinity. But no language could have been used that would have better supported Trinitarianism. It is a mistake to suppose that the omission of the Greek article before the word "God" indicates another than the deity, as is shown by many such texts as the following where it is omitted in the original text. "With men this is impossible; but with God [not *the* God] all things are possible" (Matt. 19:26).

When the apostle Thomas, who had doubted Jesus' resurrection, saw the Master in his resurrected form he exclaimed, "My Lord and my God" (John 20:28). These words of Thomas could not have been a mere ejaculation addressed to no one, else they would have been profane. But that they were not profane, and that they were true of him and not a mistaken idea of Thomas, is evident from Jesus' answer of approval which immediately follows. "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever" (Heb. 1:8). Here the inspired writer is endeavoring to show that Christ is superior to the angels, and therefore he quotes these words from the Old Testament in which he is called God. "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory"

(1 Tim. 3:16). This verse is true only of Christ, not of the Father. Therefore Christ is here called God. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, the everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace" (Isa. 9:6). "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us" (Matt. 1:23). The ascription to Christ of the divine title "God" in the two foregoing texts is so clear that no comment is necessary. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he [God] hath purchased with his own blood" (Acts 20:28). Here it is said that the church is purchased with the blood of God. Therefore Christ is called God.

"Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever" (Rom. 9:5). This verse first affirms that Christ, as to his human nature, is descended from Israel, but in antithesis to the words "according to the flesh" the Apostle says he is "over all," or the Supreme Being, and "God," who is "blessed forever." This is a clear affirmation that Christ is God, which was written to show that Jesus was not merely human. The last three words "God blessed forever" can not properly be regarded as a doxology, as is done by Socinian and Arian writers, because according to the universal usage of the New Testament writers it should then read, "Blessed be God forever," which reading is inadmissible. Another reason why it can not properly be regarded as a doxology is that if God were the subject, as it would be if this were a doxology, then the article should be used with it in the original, which is not done.

(2) *Christ is called Jehovah.*—The name "Jehovah" is the highest and most distinctive name of the true God. It represents God as being the self-existing One. It is the name of himself God gave to Moses at the burning bush, and is commonly translated "Lord" in the English Authorized Version, but in the Revised Version is rendered "Jehovah." "And God spake unto Moses and said unto him, I am the Lord: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name *Jehovah* was I not

known to them'' (Exod. 6:2, 3). It is an appropriate name for the Deity in that it expresses his attributes of eternity and immutability. But this name is used, not only of the Father, but also of Christ, showing he is divine in the highest sense.

''Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called: *Jehovah our righteousness*'' (Jer. 23:5, 6, A. S. V.). Certainly this righteous Branch of David who was to save God's people and who was to be their righteousness can be no other than Christ. And he is called Jehovah.

''As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight'' (Matt. 1:2, 3). In Matt. 11:10 Jesus clearly states that this messenger and the voice in the wilderness was John the Baptist. He was the forerunner who prepared the way before Christ. This much is certain. The latter part of Mark's quotation is from Isaiah where the prophet said, ''Prepare ye in the wilderness the way of Jehovah'' (Isa. 40:3, A. S. V.). From this it is certain that John the Baptist prepared the way before Christ, and that Christ is called Jehovah: The first part of Mark's quotation is from Mal. 3:1 where ''Jehovah'' says his messenger, John the Baptist, ''shall prepare the way before me.'' Then Jehovah must be Christ, or Christ must be called Jehovah.

2. **Divine Attributes of Christ.**—Certain characteristics, perfections without limitation, from their very nature can properly be attributed only to God. Yet such divine attributes are very often ascribed to Christ in the Bible either by positive affirmation or by implication. Therefore Christ must be divine in the highest sense of the term.

(1) *Eternity.*—''Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am'' (John 8:58). No language could be used that would more clearly teach that eternity is an attribute of Christ. It does not merely teach preexistence of Christ, that he existed before his incarnation and even before Abraham. If this were all that Jesus meant he would

have said, "Before Abraham was, I was." But he uses "I am" to show the Jews that he was not only fifty years old, which they denied; that he had not only seen Abraham, which they questioned; but that he is eternal. He described his eternity in words similar to those in which God affirmed his self-existent and eternal nature in speaking to Moses at the burning bush. The Socinian gloss, intended to evade the force of this text, which reads, "Before Abraham existed, I existed in the purpose and plan of God," is undeserving of notice.

"In the beginning was the Word. . . . The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made" (John 1:1-3). This text not only states that Christ existed prior to his incarnation, but it states that he is eternal. He is not said to have begun to be in the beginning, but that then he "was" already existing. He is described as creator of all things made; therefore he did not begin to be, else he created himself. Socinians have paraphrased this text to read, "In the beginning of Christ's ministry he was; his sentiments, sympathies, and purposes were with God—were accordant with the divine will; and he was God to his church." But such a superfluous truism as this makes of the first clause is unworthy of the inspired writer. Another statement from the same Scripture writer plainly speaks of Christ as eternal. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you *that eternal life, which was with the Father,* and was manifested unto us)" (1 John 1:1, 2). "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty" (Rev. 1:8).

(2) *Immutability.* "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and forever" (Heb. 13:8). No language could more clearly affirm unchangeableness of Christ. He is immutable as is the Father in the perfection of his nature and divine personality. In all the mutations incident to his incarnation he was unchangeable in this respect.

(3) *Omnipresence.* "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go

ye therefore, and teach all nations . . . and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen" (Matt. 28: 18-20). The promise of his presence with his disciples in connection with the command of Jesus to evangelize all nations was doubtless for their encouragement. He would be with them to assist them wherever they went. This implies omnipresence on the part of Jesus. The same divine attribute must be understood as being implied in his "upholding all things by the word of his power" (Heb. 1:3). A text even more definite, if possible, concerning the omnipresence of Christ is that in Matt. 18:20—"For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." From the context it is certain Christ here means he is omnipresent as God has been shown to be omnipresent. He is present in every local assembly of his people, according to this text, to hear and answer their prayers, and to exercise government. In this very real sense Christ is the head of his church. He is present everywhere in that very practical sense of power to know and to do. Omnipresence is also implied in the words, "The Son of man which is in heaven" (John 3:13). These words were spoken while he was incarnate on earth. Even then he was potentially omnipresent in his range of knowledge and action. He healed the nobleman's son who was twenty-five miles distant, and knew of the death of Lazarus at Bethany while he was still beyond the Jordan. Such a potential omnipresence is the only sense in which God may be certainly proved to be ubiquitous. Therefore Christ is equal with the Father in this attribute.

(4) *Omniscience.*—The attributes of eternity and omnipresence necessarily imply omniscience in Christ in the fullest sense as they do in the Father. Unlimited knowledge in Christ is also necessarily implied in his relation as the final judge of all men. Only an omniscient person is fitted justly to judge the world. The Scriptures usually represent his omniscience as knowledge of men's inmost thoughts, which is possible only to God and which implies a knowledge of all things. "Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee" (John 21:17). "Now we are sure that thou knowest all things" (John 16:30). He is frequently spoken of as "perceiving the thoughts" of persons and as "knowing what is in man." Also Jesus said, "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the father" (John 10:15).

Only an omniscient being could possibly know the infinite Father as that omniscient Father knows him.

One text seems to be contradictory to the foregoing proofs of the omniscience of Christ. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father" (Mark 13:32). This is the strongest antitrinitarian text in all the Bible. But one lone text ought not to be so interpreted as to contradict many others equally clear and the whole tenor of Scripture. We should enquire then, is it capable of an interpretation in harmony with these many other texts that clearly teach Christ's divinity? The genuineness of the text has been questioned, but not disproved. The most common method of interpreting it by Trinitarian writers is to say that as man he did not know the time referred to, but as God he did know it. Such a distinction has been made between the divine and human consciousness in Christ in explanation of this text from Athanasius and the fathers before him to the present time. Possibly it is a proper exegesis of the text. If so then it must be protected against the Nestorian error of denying the unity of the human and divine natures in one person. Because of a failure to understand the text in the Trinitarian sense it should not be interpreted contradictory to all the sure Bible proofs of the Trinity.

(5) *Omnipotence.* That Christ was possessed of the attribute of almightiness is evident from the miraculous works of power recorded of him. These are so numerous it is needless to cite particular examples.

3. **Divine Works of Christ.**—Some works are of such a nature that they peculiarly belong to the Divine Being. If the Scriptures clearly represent these as being performed by Christ, then we must admit he is divine.

(1) *Creation.* No work is more truly the work of God than creation. Only God can be the creator of all things. In its nature it requires the divine attributes of eternity and omnipotence. But Christ is said to be creator of all things. "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. . . . He was in the world, and the world was made by him" (John 1:3, 10). "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all

things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist" (Col. 1:16, 17). "And, thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands" (Heb. 1:10). All these texts clearly attribute creation to Christ. Therefore Christ is God. Yet he is not the Father. The doctrine of the Trinity is the only theory by which these facts can be harmonized. Conservation of all things, another divine work, is also attributed to him. "Upholding all things by the word of his power" (Heb. 1:3).

(2) *Pardon of sin and final judgment.* "And when he saw their faith, he said unto him, Man, thy sins are forgiven thee. And the scribes and the Pharisees began to reason, saying, Who is this which speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins, but God alone? But when Jesus perceived their thoughts, he answering said unto them, What reason ye in your hearts? Whether is easier, to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Rise up and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power upon earth to forgive sins, (he said unto the sick of the palsy,) I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch, and go into thine house" (Luke 5:20-24). In the nature of things only the one against whom sin is committed is qualified to pardon that wrong-doing. Jesus could consistently forgive moral transgression against God only on the ground that he was God. The Pharisees were right in their question "Who can forgive sin, but God alone?" Their error, like that of modern Unitarians, was in disallowing that Jesus is divine.

Christ will also be the judge of all men in the last day. "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ" (2 Cor. 5:10). See also Matt. 25:31-46 and John 5:22, 27. Only one possessing full knowledge of every moral act and thought, and also a perfect knowledge of men's motives and just deserts for all, can justly judge the world. Only God possesses such knowledge, which amounts practically to omniscience. Therefore Christ is God.

4. **The Worship of Christ.**—The Scriptures everywhere represent God alone as being the proper object of worship, and condemn the worship of all others most severely as idolatry. But Christ is described in the Bible as being worshiped with his

approval and even by divine injunction. Therefore he is God, else Christianity supports rank idolatry.

"When he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him" (Heb. 1:6). This text plainly demands the worship of Christ by angels in heaven. If he is a proper object of worship for them, he is also for us. But unless he is divine such worship would be idolatry. "All men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father" (John 5:23). No higher honor can be accorded to the Father than divine worship. Jesus here unmistakably teaches we should honor the Son in the same degree, which means necessarily that we worship him as God.

Christ was worshiped by men full of the Holy Spirit who knew the truth. "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon the Lord, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. . . . Lay not this sin to their charge" (Acts 7:59, 60, A. S. V.). These are the words of the dying Stephen in the hour of his martyrdom, of whom it is specifically stated that at that time he was "full of the Holy Ghost" (v. 55), and is elsewhere described as a man of wisdom. We know he was one of the foremost preachers of the early church. He could not have been in error in this prayer. Yet he addressed his prayer and committed his soul to Christ, not the Father. Such prayer and worship as this is due only to God. If Christ be not God, then Stephen's dying prayer was not a whit above Mariolatry or idolatry. Worship and prayer to Christ was common to the apostles and early Christians. "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth . . . with all that in every place *call upon the name of Jesus Christ* our Lord" (1 Cor. 1:2). "Then they that were in the ship came and worshiped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God" (Matt. 14:33). The man born blind whose eyes Jesus opened said, "Lord, I believe. And he worshiped him" (John 9:38). And Jesus allowed their worship of him, which he certainly could not have done if it were idolatry. Of his thorn in the flesh, Paul said, "For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me" (2 Cor. 12:8). The one to whom he prayed answered, "My grace is sufficient for thee" (v. 9). Then Paul said, "Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the *power of Christ* may rest upon me." Inasmuch as the one to whom Paul prayed gave him his power to endure

this suffering and that power was the "power of Christ," then Paul prayed to Christ. This worshipfulness of Christ is evidence that he is God.

IV. The Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit

The third person of the divine Trinity is variously named "the Holy Spirit," "the Spirit of God," "the Spirit," when reference has been made to God "his Spirit," and when God speaks "my Spirit." His being designated Spirit is for the purpose, doubtless, of representing his relationship to the Trinity. As the Son is called the Word because he is the revealer of God, so the third person in the Godhead is called Spirit because he is the one who is especially the power or worker in the Godhead in effecting men's redemption. Christ atones for sin, but the Spirit convicts, regenerates, witnesses, and teaches. Among the early Christians as with many devout Christians at the present, the truth concerning the Holy Spirit was held as it appears on the surface of the Scriptures without any attempt at harmonizing or formulating the doctrine. It was only when the church was confronted by the rise of heresies concerning the Trinity that the doctrine was carefully formulated and given exact expression. The two points of special importance in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit are his personality and divinity. Only Unitarians deny his divinity, but sometimes Trinitarians, who theoretically hold his personality, in their common thought regard him as a mere power or influence because of confusing in their minds his operations and his personality. Both his personality and divinity are essential elements of the Trinitarian doctrine.

1. **Personality of the Spirit.**—A person is a being possessed of intelligence, will, and individual existence who can say I, thou, he, me, my, mine. The Holy Spirit may be said to be a person because of his possessing these characteristics. Proof of his personality does not require that evidence be given of his having each of these several qualities. All may often be included in a single proof.

His personality is shown by the use concerning him of the personal pronoun. When he speaks he says "I." "When he is spoken to "thou" is used. When he is spoken of "he" or "him" is used. Such usage clearly implies personality. It is true that

inanimate things are sometimes personified, but such personification is a mere figure of speech and except in very rare cases is evident, and in view of the facts creates no difficulty in this argument. "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto *I* have called them" (Acts 13:2). Here the Spirit uses the pronoun of the first person of himself. "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, *he* shall testify of me" (John 15:26). "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you" (John 16:13, 14). Here in three verses the pronoun of the third person is used of the Holy Spirit nine times.

His personality is shown by his being associated with other persons of the Trinity. In the baptismal formula we are taught to acknowledge the Spirit as we do the Father and the Son. We are baptized in his name as in the names of them. Here the personality of the Father and Son are beyond question. No more reason exists for denying personality to the Spirit. It can not be supposed we are to baptize in the name of the Father and also in the name of an indefinite form of his power. When the Apostle tells the Corinthians they were not baptized in the name of Paul, he means they were not made his disciples. In the same sense to be baptized in the name of the Holy Spirit is to acknowledge ourselves his disciples. And it is not to be supposed we are disciples of an impersonal energy. Also in the apostolic benediction (2 Cor. 13:14) the Holy Spirit is associated with the other members of the Trinity as a person among persons with an earnest prayer for his communion which is possible only to a person.

Especially is the personality of the Spirit shown by the ascription to him of personal acts. "The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. . . . So they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia" (Acts 13:2-4). Unless these words mean more than that these brethren at Antioch felt impressed that these two men were suitable for the work suggested, then they are misleading. How the Spirit spoke we do not know, but

that he spoke and that his message was definite is clearly affirmed. It is plainly the act of a person described here. "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost" (Acts 5:3). It is not possible to lie to a power or a mere influence, but only to a person. "The Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which can not be uttered" (Rom. 8:26). Only a person can thus intercede, especially with such intensity of feeling. Other works ascribed to the Spirit might be mentioned that constitute conclusive proof of his personality. He may be grieved (Eph. 4:30); despited (Heb. 10:29); he reproves (John 14:13); teaches (Luke 12:12); witnesses (Rom. 8:16); comforts (John 14:16); guides and predicts future events (John 16:13); regenerates (John 3:5), and sanctifies (Rom. 15:16).

2. **Divinity of the Holy Spirit.**—As the vital truth concerning Christ is his divinity, so is the proof of personality concerning the Spirit important to the doctrine of the Trinity. When these are admitted the divinity of the Holy Spirit is usually accepted. Yet to fill out and strengthen the argument for the Trinity it is well also to give proof of this.

The Holy Spirit is often called God. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Cor. 3:16). Because the Spirit of God dwells in men they are here said to be the temple of God, which implies that he is God. "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God" (Acts 5:3, 4). If lying to the Holy Ghost is lying to God, then the Holy Ghost is God. The apostle Paul says in Acts 28:25, "Well spoke the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet," and gives a quotation from Isa. 6:9 where the words are said to be those of Jehovah. The fact that the Holy Ghost is Jehovah is similarly shown also by a comparison of Heb. 10:15 with Jer. 31:31, 33, 34.

The Holy Spirit is also shown by the Bible to be possessed of various divine attributes. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God" (Heb. 9:14). Only God is eternal; therefore the Spirit is God. The Holy Spirit is said to be omnipresent in that notable text in Psa. 139:7 which begins, "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?"

His omniscience is declared by the apostle Paul in 1 Cor. 2:10, 11 where he says the Spirit knows all things, "yea, the deep things of God." He is said to know the things of God as the spirit of a man knows the things of the man. A proof of the divinity of the Holy Spirit is also found in the declaration that blasphemy against the Father or Son may be forgiven, but if it is against the Holy Spirit it may not be forgiven (Matt. 12:31). Certainly a dignity so exalted can not be his except he is God.

The Holy Ghost is also recognized as God by the ascription of divine works to him. He operated in the creation of the world (Gen. 1:2). He inspired the writing of the Word of God; therefore he must be God. "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter 1:21).

The Holy Spirit is not so commonly set forth in the Scriptures as an object of worship as is the Son, yet his worshipfulness is implied in the proofs that he is God, especially in such texts as those that warn against the danger of blaspheming him. What has been said is sufficient evidence that inasmuch as he is of the same substance as the Father and Son he is therefore equal with them in power and glory. But as the Son is subordinate to the Father in the mode of his subsistence and operations in the world, so is the Holy Spirit represented as subordinate to both the Father and Son in that he proceeds from or is of the same substance with them and is sent by them to men.

3. **Procession of the Spirit.**—The doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit and especially as to his relation to the other persons of the Trinity was very confused prior to the Council of Nicea. The church generally held the facts concerning him that are revealed on the surface of the Scriptures, but those who attempted to harmonize those facts often went far astray. The statement of faith formulated by the Nicene Council only repeated what was before stated in the Apostle's Creed, which merely said, "I believe in the Holy Ghost." As a remedy for the continued confusion the Council of Constantinople, which met in 381 A. D., added to the earlier creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the divine, the life-giving, who proceedeth from the Father, who is to be worshiped and glorified with the Father and the Son, and

who spake through the prophets." The later creed, the Athanasian, states that the Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and Son; that He is uncreated, eternal, and omnipotent, equal in majesty and glory; and that He proceeds from the Father and the Son. The Athanasian symbol includes two elements not found in the Constantinopolitan—that the Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and also the Spirit is said to proceed, not only from the Father, but also from the Son. At the Synod of Toledo in 589 the Constantinopolitan creed was amended by the addition of the word Filioque, "And the Son." The controversy resulting from the addition of this word was one of the principal causes that led to the separation of the church into the Greek and Roman divisions. The Athanasian creed represents the doctrine of the large portion of Christians ever since its formulation and is the faith of evangelical Christians today.

By the procession of the Spirit is meant the mode of his subsistence in relation to the Godhead. The Spirit's procession is an inscrutable mystery, as is the idea of the Trinity.

The Scriptures clearly affirm the procession of the Spirit from the Father. "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me" (John 15: 26). It need not necessarily be understood that the sense of the term "proceedeth" as used here implies more than that the Spirit is sent from the Father to believers, but evangelical Christians of both the past and the present have commonly interpreted it to describe his mode of subsistence in the Godhead. But apart from what may be the true sense of this particular text this relationship of the Spirit to the Father called procession is a necessary and eternal one. If it were by an optional act of the Father, then the Spirit would not be eternal and therefore not God. Arianism would make Christ a creature of the Father and the Spirit creation by Christ, but the true doctrine of the Trinity can admit nothing less than the eternity of them both. To say the Spirit proceeds from the Father is merely to say that he is of the same essence with the Father.

The procession of the Spirit from the Son also is not explicitly stated in the Scriptures. Yet it may be clearly inferred much in the same sense as is the Trinity itself. The relationship of the Spirit to the Son is the same as that to the Father. He is

not only called the Spirit of God, but also the Spirit of Christ. (Rom. 8:9). If the Trinitarian doctrine is true that he is not the Spirit of God in that he is related to God as a man's spirit is related to the man, but is only such in that he proceeds from the Father, then he must be the Spirit of Christ in the same sense. Thus the Scriptures support the statement of the Athanasian symbol that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. Also the procession of the Spirit from the Son is a logical requirement on the ground that the Father and the Son are of the same essence. Again, it may be reasoned that because Christ as well as the Father sends, or pours out the Spirit on men, thus showing the Spirit's relation to both, the ground for such relation is in his proceeding from them both.

Chapter III

THE WORKS OF GOD

I. God's Work in Creation

The minds of men have always been exercised with the question of the origin of the universe. The universe is either eternal or else it began to be. Constant change in existing things is evidence that at least in its present form it is not eternal, but had a beginning. This is generally admitted. Plato assumed matter was self-existent or eternal, and that God used it to construct the cosmos. Aristotle held eternity, not only of this matter, but also of its present orderly form. Pantheists identify God with matter and regard it as eternal and that by its power of self-action present things have been formed. Other theories have been advanced that attribute intelligence and self-action to nature itself. Another class of theories are those that attribute the universe to purely physical, non-intelligent forces. An example of this class is the naturalistic theory of evolution of all things from a primitive nebula. All these pantheistic and naturalistic theories of creation are atheistic and were sufficiently refuted under theism. Human reasoning has struggled in vain with the problem of the origin of the world. Only in Revelation is it set in a clear light. The prevalence of the idea, if not the original conception, of the creation of the world out of nothing is due to the Bible, which clearly teaches that God created the universe out of nothing.

For clearness in thought it is important to distinguish between the several spheres of creative work. (1) Matter may be thought of as having been created and as existing independent of any orderly form of it. Matter and its properties are distinct only for abstract thought, but the existence of matter and its arrangement in orderly forms is an actual distinction. A chaotic state of matter is conceivable. It is possible to think of the matter which now composes the physical universe as having once existed in a shapeless mass. The Bible states that the time was when matter did so exist. "The earth was without form, and void" (Gen. 1:2). This distinction between the existence of chaotic matter and the cosmos is important for the purpose of showing that even though it could be proved that matter were

eternal, it would not therefore follow that the cosmos or the orderly arrangement of nature is eternal, nor its naturalistic development a necessary consequence. (2) We may also conceive of the formation of preexistent matter into orderly arrangement in the shape of a sphere, with its various distinct substances, continents, seas, atmosphere, clouds, mountains, and strata. Such order is conceivable apart from the existence of any form of life. (3) The origin of all organic nature including plant and animal life is thinkable as having originated subsequently to matter and inorganic forms. (4) Still another distinct sphere of creative work is in the origination of mind. In its nature, its qualities, and the possibility of knowing it only through phenomena it is clearly distinguishable and altogether different from matter. Such distinctions are made in the Bible and the recognition of them is important to its proper interpretation.

1. **Matter Created Out of Nothing.**—Not only in theology, but also in science and philosophy the question of the eternity of matter has ever been a source of conflicting views. Theological thought is not rationally limited to the creation of matter from nothing. The theistic argument is equally strong whether we reason that a divine person is necessary to the creation of the cosmos out of nothing, or whether we assume the eternity of matter and reason that he is required to change it into an orderly universe.

Only on the grounds of the Scriptures can we certainly know the truth concerning this subject. It has not infrequently been reasoned that to admit the eternity of matter would be to limit God in such a sense that he would not be the absolute, and that if matter were eternal it would be independent of him and be another God. But equally able thinkers do not regard such reasoning as conclusive against the possibility of both God's absoluteness and the eternity of matter.

Science has also failed to give any clear light on the question under consideration. It has no sure data determinative of the question, and probably the sphere of science is such that it should not be expected to provide such data. Sir John Herschel and Professor Clerk Maxwell endeavor to prove that matter has been created by showing that the atoms of matter bear marks of being "manufactured articles." Maxwell says, "The exact equality of each molecule to all others of the same kind gives it

the essential character of a manufactured article, and precludes the idea of its being eternal and self-existent.'' But inasmuch as there is no general concurrence of scientific authorities regarding this subject and especially in consideration of the fact that the present form of the molecules and atoms may be regarded as the molding of God out of preexistent but divinely created matter it may well be assumed that science furnishes no light either for or against the origin of matter.

Turning to the Bible, we find proof of the creation of matter out of nothing, but that proof is not of a philological nature as is sometimes supposed. Various Hebrew words in the Old Testament and Greek words in the New are used indiscriminately to express originative creation out of nothing and to form out of existing matter. In this respect they are similar to the English terms create, make, or do. The Bible proof of an originative creation of matter is to be found in the connections in which these words are used. The first Biblical use of the term translated ''create'' is as follows: ''In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void'' (Gen. 1:1, 2). From this second verse we learn that at one time the earth was formless and empty. It was a shapeless mass of matter that had not been arranged in any orderly form. But the preceding verse affirms that creation had already taken place. This took place in the ''beginning,'' which doubtless means the beginning of time. Time began with the origin of that which is not eternal. Therefore the origin of matter must mark the beginning of time. It should be noted that the formless and void condition of the earth was not before, but at or after it was created. ''Create'' as used in the first verse could not refer to the orderly arrangement of matter which is said in verse two not yet to have taken place, but must refer to the creation of matter out of nothing. That verse two is a continuation of the history of verse one and not the beginning of a new history is implied in the conjunction at the beginning of the second verse translated ''and.'' Hebrew scholars state that this word is never used to begin a new history.

It is said of God in Rom. 4:17 that he ''calleth those things which be not as though they were.'' To ''call'' as here used may be understood in the sense of commanding or controlling things that are not, which would imply the actual origination of them.

Or it may mean, according to Dewette, that God "calls the non-existing into existence." A clearer statement of creation out of nothing could scarcely be made than that given in Heb. 11:3: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Here it is declared that the world we now see was created by God, but not from materials that appear or that may be seen. It is equal to saying it was created out of nothing.

Not only in these positive statements do we have evidence that matter began to be, but also in the silence of the Sacred Record concerning the eternity of matter. A still further evidence is the common Bible distinction between God's eternity and the temporariness of all other existences.

2. **Creative Work Not Necessary to God.**—The theory has not been uncommonly held that the nature of God is such that creation was necessary by him. It has been reasoned that as consciousness in a human being arises only through sensation which is dependent upon the external or that which is not self, so God could come to consciousness only by originating other existences. In objection to such reasoning for the necessity of creation, it may be said that it implies a contradiction in that it makes God create for the *purpose* of gaining for himself self-consciousness. But self-consciousness is necessary to such purposing. If God became conscious *through* creating the world, he could not have been conscious *when* he did it. If he were not then conscious there would have been no such thing as design in creation. The marks of design in nature are opposed to this argument for necessitated creation. Also even if human consciousness is developed only by sensation, it does not follow that a purely spiritual incorporeal being whether created or divine is likewise dependent upon sensation and objective existence for consciousness.

It is further reasoned that the plenitude of the divine nature is such that it must necessarily overflow in creating other existences. If this were true then there must necessarily have been an eternal overflow in creative work and created existences must be eternal and infinite. But evidence is abundant that nature is temporal. Again it is held there is a moral necessity with God to create. It is held that because God is love, and

it is the nature of love to long to communicate itself and to make others happy, therefore he must necessarily create other beings. In objection it may be said that then he must have had that necessity from eternity and so his creation must be eternal and infinite in extant. But such is not found to be true.

The common faith of Christians is that God was free in creating. Freedom is implied in personality, and creation is the work of a person. In his infinite wisdom he created the universe for his glory.

3. **The Genesis Record Historical.**—The Mosaic narrative of creation avoids the mistake of stating the universe is eternal. Also it does not commit the error common to pagan cosmogonies of assigning for the world a pantheistic origin. It begins with a personal, supreme God who originates matter and then later out of that material by progressive stages develops the cosmos. The Mosaic record of creation is far superior to all pagan cosmogonies, differing from them as widely as does truth from fiction. But the first step necessary to an understanding of the Bible teaching concerning creation is to inquire concerning the historic character of the Genesis narrative. There are different views concerning its interpretation. (1) It is regarded as being a true literal history. This has been and is at present the common method of interpretation among Christians. (2) It is said to be poetical in its nature and therefore not a veritable history of actual events. (3) It is assumed to be an allegory, either with or without a historical meaning also. (4) A modern tendency is to regard it as being only a myth or fable similar to and of no more historical value than similar cosmogonies that are found in the early literature of all nations.

That the first chapter of Genesis is not a mere unhistorical, poetic outburst is evident from the narrative itself. It lacks almost all the elements of Hebrew poetry. It is true that nearly one third of the Old Testament is poetry. Poetry is found especially in the prophetical portions. There is rhythm in parallelism of thoughts and other distinctive characteristics of Hebrew poetry. But no more straightforward prose narrative can be found in all the Bible than this record of creation. It is not printed in poetical form in the Revised Version. But even if it could be shown to be poetry would this prove it is not a true historical record? Is poetry to be confounded with fiction? Or

are they synonymous? Much of the Psalms is historical. See Psalms 136. Nor can better reasons be given for supposing it is to be interpreted allegorically. The parables and other symbolic descriptions of the Scriptures are in such a style and so clearly such that little difficulty is experienced in recognizing them as symbolic. But here we have not so much as a single hint that the narrative is intended to be other than a plain historical account.

The best argument against the poetical and allegorical as well as the mythical theory of interpretation is the positive proofs that the narrative is historical. The first reason for accepting this portion of Scripture as history is that it purports to be such. A second reason is that it is a part of an acknowledged historical writing and is a proper and necessary introduction to that history. A third reason is that in every reference to it by Jesus, his apostles, or other inspired writers it is always regarded as a credible record of the creation. A fourth reason for believing the Mosaic creation narrative is historic in character is the fact that the account there given of the creation, probation, and fall of man is made the basis of the entire scheme of redemption through Christ. The facts there recorded are the foundation of all the Bible.

The supreme interest of the creation narrative is not scientific, but religious. It is in this respect in harmony with the great purpose of the Bible as a whole. Yet the dominance of the religious element should not be supposed to exclude a statement of essential facts from the narrative. Nothing could more certainly represent the greatness and infinite power of God than the simple record of the facts of creation. It is true it could not have been given otherwise than according to popular conceptions in that unscientific age, but a statement may be essentially true though not given in scientific terms. Even in a scientific age it is not thought to be incorrect to speak of the rising and setting of the sun. Neither does the historic nature of the record require that we suppose the human writer had a full comprehension of the creative process. It is enough that the Inspiring Spirit knew this. May not Moses have written that which contained a meaning far beyond what he thought, as was evidently true of those who prophesied of Christ and his salvation and

then studied their own writings to learn more about the subject? (1 Peter 1:11).

4. Creation Days and Geologic Periods.— With the development of the science of geology or since the beginning of the last century the interpreter of the Biblical record of creation has had a new factor to take into consideration—the harmonizing of the Bible narrative with the findings of geology. Geology claims the strata of the earth were built up by a process that occupied a vast period of time—which has been variously estimated at from 25,000,000, to 1,600,000,000 years. The principal question that confronts the Biblical exegete is, can the Scripture record be reconciled with such a time-period and process. Those who are unsympathetic toward the science of geology or who have not given attention to its study endeavor to answer the question by denying the claims of geology. Whatever liberty one may properly claim for himself in taking such a position, it is certain that such an attitude on the part of friends of the Bible is not conducive to acceptance of its teaching by those who do accept the views of geology, which they believe are well supported by clearly ascertained facts. It is a distinct advantage to religion to show, if it can be done, that the Bible narrative is not inconsistent with the claims of science. It is improper to debar the student of science from faith in the inspired record by hedging it around with human interpretations that are not required by internal facts of the Bible. And it is never right so to interpret the Bible that it contradicts certainly known facts of nature.

Truth is always consistent with itself. Truth in the Bible never contradicts truth in nature. God is the author of both. And as the man of science errs in advancing unproved theories that are opposed to the plain statements of the Scriptures, so also does the theologian err who refuses to regard the facts of science in interpreting the Scriptures, as has been too often done. The facts of geography were rejected by those doctors of Salamanca who considered it unscriptural to hold with Columbus that the earth was not flat, but round. Also that great astronomical fact that it is the earth that moves in the heavens and the sun stands still, was rejected by Francis Turrettine when it was set forth by Newton and Galileo. The present-day exegete of the Scriptures does well to beware that he does not deny facts of

geology in order to make a place for an erroneous interpretation of the Bible. It may not be incumbent upon the theologian to furnish the proof of the claims of science, but it is certainly important that he take account of those claims to the degree that he will point out their agreement with the Scriptures if such is possible.

During the last century three different theories have been more or less prevalent for reconciling the Mosaic six days of creation with the measureless periods of the geologic cosmogony. The first theory advanced was the reconstruction theory by Dr. Thomas Chalmers early in the last century. When geologists first set forth the idea that the earth did not come into being a few thousand years ago as had been not uncommonly assumed it was this noted theologian who promptly came forward with the statement that the Bible nowhere stated the time of the earth's creation and that if the Bible genealogies proved anything it was only the time of the creation of man. Chalmers' scheme of reconciling the Bible and the geologic records assumed that vast periods of time intervened between the creative work of the first verse of Genesis 1 and what followed in the chapter. He supposed that Gen. 1:1 describes a creation of orderly nature with many forms of plant and animal life, and that this continued for countless ages during which the geologic formations took place. The theory further supposes these geologic periods were followed by a chaotic period when such conditions developed that all life on the face of the earth became extinct and at least there if not in the heavens darkness and chaos prevailed. Then it is supposed a reconstruction of the cosmos took place as described in Genesis 1, during six literal twenty-four hour days.

If the geologic facts could be shown to agree with such a reconstruction, this theory would satisfactorily reconcile the Bible and science at this point. It has not been commonly urged that the interior facts of Scripture require such a double creation. The advocates of the theory have rather held that the second verse of the Bible is so worded that it merely makes a place for such a former creation. But such an interpretation of this verse appears to be an unnatural one. The history seems to be continuous. No such double creation was found there by exegetes until they were confronted with the necessity of harmonizing the Mosaic narrative with geology. Such an exegesis

simplifies interpretation relative to the length of the creative days, but great difficulties are found in the lack of scientific facts to support it. A break at a certain point in the geologic deposits of certain parts of the world has been noted, but no general chaotic period is to be found in the geologic record. In reference to this point the great geologist Hugh Miller, who was himself a firm believer in the Bible, says, "From the present time up to the times represented by the earliest Eocene formations of the Tertiary division, day has succeeded day, and season has followed season, and no chasm or hiatus—no age of general chaos, darkness, and death—has occurred, to break the line of succession, or check the course of life. *All the evidence runs counter to the supposition that immediately before the appearance of man upon the earth there existed a chaotic period which separated the previous from the present creation.* (Testimony of the Rocks, p. 155).

With the progress of geologic science it became apparent that facts did not support the theory of Dr. Chalmers. Twenty-five years after the publication of his theory, Dr. Pye Smith advanced a scheme of harmonizing the Bible with geology, which is really but a modification of the theory of Chalmers. Smith held with Chalmers except on the one point of a universal chaos and an entirely new creation of life. He supposed the chaotic condition was of limited extent. Following the geological ages it is assumed that a particular locality, probably in southwestern Asia, was submerged and nature there was reduced to chaos, while in other parts of the earth life continued in unbroken succession even until the present. Then the six days of creation described beginning at Gen. 1:2 was of only particular species including man and was limited to that local section.

But whatever may be said in favor of such a theory it is confronted with serious difficulties. It has no more internal Scriptural support than the first theory. It requires that the word "earth" used in Gen. 1:2 and subsequent verses be given a very restricted meaning inconsistent with its usage elsewhere. By reducing the creation of Moses' narrative to a mere local reconstruction it seriously impairs the idea of God's absoluteness which this account of creation is supposed to teach. This theory deprives the creation account of its high sublimity. Such a theory does not have support in the facts of geology. Hugh

Miller rejects it on these grounds and says "it fails to satisfy me."

A third method of reconciling the Mosaic record and geology is to regard the six days, not as literal twenty-four hour days, but as symbolic days representative of geological ages. Strong reasons can be given for such an interpretation. The events of creation could not be known to man like the later patriarchal and Israelitish history, but only by divine revelation. In this respect the account of creation is much of the same nature as is prophecy. It might be described as inverted prophecy. The Bible prophecies, as in the "seventy weeks" prediction of Dan. 9:24, often use a day as a symbol of a longer period of time. May it not be then that when God revealed the events of creation to man he employed a similar method, possibly by representing the events in vision to the seer with periods or days to represent geological ages? The most certain interpretation of prophecy is always in the light of its fulfilment in history. The best proof that the seventy weeks of Daniel are weeks of years rather than of twenty-four hour days is the fact that according to history exactly that many years elapsed between the events described. It is accepted as a sound principle of Biblical interpretation that these prophetic symbols must be interpreted in agreement with the facts of history. "In what light, or on what principle, shall we most correctly read the prophetic drama of creation? In the light, I reply, of scientific discovery—on the principle that the clear and certain must be accepted, when attainable, as the proper exponents of the doubtful and obscure."—Hugh Miller. If we employ here this common method of interpreting predictions of the future, we shall understand these six days in the light of that history afforded by the record of the rocks. Those best qualified to read that record tell us those periods symbolically called days were probably millions of years in duration. If they are not to be regarded as twenty-four hour days, but symbols of long periods, then there is no reason why they can not be regarded as being whatever length geologic findings require. In the light of this principle of interpretation it would be as unreasonable to insist that these days were twenty-four hour days as to hold that the coming of Christ and other events predicted in the ninth chapter of Daniel occurred four hundred and ninety days after the going forth of the command to restore and rebuild

Jerusalem in 457 B. C. As further proof that "day" in the creation record does not necessarily mean twenty-four hours, observe that the identical period described in Genesis 1 as six days is in chapter 2:4 called *one* day.

That the six days of the Mosaic narrative are symbolic of the geologic periods is the view of the majority of the most learned and devout exegetes at present and is rapidly gaining acceptance with the average Christian. This view is not altogether a modern view forced upon interpreters by science. Some of the early Christian fathers as Origen, Augustine, and Aquinas doubted whether those six days were to be taken in a literal sense. To regard the six days as symbolic days, representative of the geological periods, is by far the simplest and most reasonable method for reconciling Genesis and geology.

"Day" is frequently used in the Scriptures in other senses than of the twenty-four hour day. It is sometimes used for a year, sometimes for an indefinite period as in the expressions "the day of your calamity," "the day of salvation," or in reference to the gospel dispensation, and in Gen. 1:5 it is used of the period of light in antithesis to night. In Gen. 2:4 is the expression "in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." If it be objected to regarding these six days as long periods on the ground that God rested the seventh day, it may be answered that it is altogether consistent with God's rest from his creative work to say that the seventh period in which he rested was of great duration, for he is still resting from creative work. Instead of the seventh day of the creative week being against the idea of long periods it rather supports the idea.

5. **Agreement of Moses and Science.**—The first step necessary to a reconciliation of the Mosaic record of creation with that record written in the rocks of which geologists tell us is to harmonize the six days with the geologic time-periods. This has been done. But the agreement must be shown, not only in the length of time occupied in the creative work, but also in the order of events in the process. Here the agreement between the Bible and science is remarkable. Not only do eminent scientists fail to find any serious contradiction between Moses and geology, but they testify to finding a very remarkable corroboration of the Mosaic account in nature. Some of the very ablest scientists have shown this agreement, including such men

as James D. Dana, M. A., L. L. D., Professor of Geology and Natural History in Yale University; Alexander Winchell, eminent as a geologist, a writer on scientific subjects, and professor in the University of Michigan; Professor Arnold Guyot of Princeton, whom Dana describes as "a philosopher of enlarged comprehension of nature"; Professor C. H. Hitchcock of Amherst; and the great geologist Hugh Miller, who in his excellent work "Testimony of the Rocks" has shown at length the harmony of Genesis and geology.

Geology affirms that creation was gradual. Genesis most clearly teaches the same. Science begins with a disorganized condition of matter. Genesis affirms that same formless condition of matter in its beginning. An unproved scientific hypothesis assumes nebula was the primordial form of matter. If that theory could be proved it would not necessarily conflict with Genesis. The nebular theory conflicts with the Bible only when it is coupled with the antitheistic idea that the formation of the cosmos from that original nebula was by resident forces alone rather than by the divine agency.

Professor Dana briefly shows the harmony of Genesis and geology by a concise statement of the steps in the process of creation as shown by each. Assuming that matter was originally in a gaseous state, he enumerates the stages as known by science as follows: "(1) Activity begun—light an immediate result. (2) The earth made an independent sphere. (3) Outlining of the land and water, determining the earth's general configuration. (4) The idea of life in the lowest plants, and afterwards, if not contemporaneously, in the lowest or systemless animals, or Protozoans. (5) The energizing light of the sun shining on the earth—an essential preliminary to the display of the systems of life. (6) Introduction of the systems of life. (7) Introduction of mammals—the highest order of the vertebrates—the class afterwards to be dignified by including a being of moral and intellectual nature. (8) Introduction of man." "The order of events in the Scripture cosmogony corresponds essentially with that which has been given. There was first a void and formless earth: this was literally true of the 'heavens and the earth,' if they were in the condition of a gaseous fluid. The succession is as follows: (1) Light. (2) The dividing of the waters below from the waters above the earth

(the word translated waters may mean fluid). (3) The dividing of the land and water on the earth. (4) Vegetation; which Moses, appreciating the philosophical characteristic of the new creation distinguishing it from previous inorganic substances, defines as that 'which had seed in itself.' (5) The sun, moon, and stars. (6) The lower animals, those that swam in the waters, and the creeping and flying species of the land. (7) Beasts of prey ('creeping' here meaning prowling). (8) Man'' (Manual of Geology, pp. 743, 745).

A full exhibition of the remarkable agreement of Genesis and geology in the details of the process of creation is neither possible because of lack of space nor appropriate to a work of this nature. Entire volumes have been written by devout and eminent scientists describing this harmony. (See Testimony of the Rocks, Hugh Miller; Reconciliation of Science and Religion, Alexander Winchell; Supplement to Chapter First in Kitto's History of the Bible, written by C. H. Hitchcock.) The possibility of such a reconciliation is adequately shown by brief general statements from those who are of the highest rank as scientists.

Following his comparison of the order of creation as furnished by Moses and geology, Professor Dana further says, ''The record in the Bible is therefore profoundly philosophical in the scheme of creation which it presents. It is both true and divine. It is a declaration of authorship, both of creation and the Bible, on the first page of the sacred volume'' (Manual of Geology, p. 745). In his chapter on the Mosaic Vision of Creation, Hugh Miller says, ''Now, I am greatly mistaken if we have not in the six geologic periods all the elements, without misplacement or exaggeration, of the Mosaic drama of creation.'' And in closing the chapter he says of the Mosaic narrative, ''I know not a single scientific truth that militates against even the minutest or least prominent of its details'' (Testimony of the Rocks, pp. 204, 210). Winchell says, ''The author of Genesis has given us an account which, when rightly understood, conforms admirably to the indications of latest science'' (Reconciliation of Science and Religion, p. 358).

With the proof that the Bible is the Word of God it is not incredible that it should harmonize with God's works in nature. The Bible, when properly interpreted, has never been found to

contradict the facts of science. The difficulties of the Biblical exegete are not in showing the agreement of the Bible with facts, but in harmonizing it with unproved and unprovable scientific theories. All the Bible teaches concerning creation wonderfully agrees with all the certainly known facts of science.

II. Creation and Evolution

1. **Evolution Not God's Method of Creation.**—No treatment of the subject of creation can be complete at the present day that fails to give consideration to the claims of the theory of evolution. Theistic evolution supposes God's agency was only mediate and that a process of evolution was God's method in the formation of both inorganic and organic nature. E. D. Cope says, "The doctrine of evolution may be defined as the teaching which holds that creation has been and is accomplished by the agency of the energies which are intrinsic in the evolving matter, and without the interference of agencies that are external to it. . . . The science of evolution is the science of creation." This statement allows no place for divine creation.

A more exact statement concerning creation as it is viewed by true evolutionists consists in the denial of it. Professor Pfleiderer says, "There is only one choice. When we say evolution we definitely deny creation. When we say creation we definitely deny evolution." Prof. James Sully writes, "The doctrine of evolution is directly antagonistic to that of creation." That creation and evolution are, in their essential nature, exclusive of each other is evident from the statement of another eminent evolutionist, Professor LeConte, who defines evolution as follows: "Evolution is (1) Progressive change, (2) according to certain laws, (3) by means of resident forces." This is the evolution theory in its true form as held by its ablest modern supporters.

In its relation to theology, however, evolution is held in at least three different forms—(1) naturalistic, (2) semi-theistic, and (3) theistic. Naturalistic evolution assumes that all nature, inorganic and organic, in all its forms has been evolved from a primitive fire-mist by resident forces and without any divine intervention whatsoever at any time. It is purely materialistic and atheistic. No power nor efficiency is admitted except what originally existed in the fire-mist. Eminent evolutionists, such as

Ernest Haeckel, have held this view and regarded it as the only consistent theory of evolution. Sufficient refutation of this view was given in the discussion of theism, where it was shown to be unproved and in its nature unprovable.

Semi-theistic evolution supposes God originally created a low form of life and endowed it with the capacity for evolving higher forms continuously. Charles Darwin admitted divine creation of a few simple forms at the beginning of life, probably not more than six, and that since that time the process has been entirely naturalistic without any divine intervention. The best that can be said of such a view is that it is consistent only with deism, and is as destructive to religion and true piety as is that form of infidelity in that it places God far away and denies the statements of the Scriptures.

Theistic evolution supposes God not only originated the first forms of life, but that he has interposed with creative efficiency at various stages of the evolutionary process. The degree to which God is admitted varies with the individuals who hold theistic evolution. Some of its advocates regard evolution as being merely the method of the divine working. They assume that in conjunction with such mediate working God intervenes with direct miraculous operations, especially in the production of man's mind, which is regarded as an immediate creation. Some theistic evolutionists assume so large an element of direct divine creation that the evolutionary process largely loses its character. To whatever extent direct creation is admitted evolution is excluded. Theistic evolution has been accorded credence by many, but it has its difficulties. It is a compromise of Christian theology with antitheistic evolution. The modern evolutionary hypothesis as originally set forth was not theistic, but naturalistic. The evolution of scientists at the present day as defined by LeConte is naturalistic. In its essential nature the supposed process of evolution has no place for divine intervention. Some of its ablest advocates among eminent scientists positively deny any miraculous intervention. Haeckel and many others have said that if the Creator is admitted at any point he may as well be admitted all along the line.

2. **Evolution and the Scriptures Irreconcilable.**—Professor Fairhurst has well said in his "Theistic Evolution" that "theistic evolution is conceivable; but Christian evolution is inconceiv-

able.'' Theism and Christianity are not identical. All Christians are theists, but all theists are not Christians. The Jews, for the most part, are theists, but not Christians. A Christian is one who believes in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures. Evolution, even when regarded as a divine method, can not be harmonized with the plain statements of the Bible. To admit divine creation into an evolutionary process at all the points required by any proper interpretation of the Biblical record would leave so little place for evolution that the process would not deserve the name.

It is inconsistent to regard the Bible as true and yet hold evolution. The more thoughtful of theistic evolutionists do not accept the Bible as fully inspired nor as being true in every part. They usually hold with the higher critics that the account of creation in Genesis 1 and 2 is not a true history, but is purely mythical and of human origin. They deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and attribute it to various unknown persons whose writings have been compiled by other unknown persons and later attributed to Moses. These writings are regarded by them as belonging to the same class of myths as those of heathen nations. Such is the view held by A. S. Peake and other equally representative writers of the critical school. If the objection is made to such loose dealing with the inspired record that Jesus and the apostles attributed the Pentateuch to Moses (Mark 12:26; Luke 24:44; John 1:45; 5:46, 47) they agree, but they say that either ignorantly or intentionally Jesus misrepresented the facts concerning the authorship of the Pentateuch.

Such an attitude toward the Scriptures is the only one that is consistent with theistic evolution. Professor Fairhurst says, ''I feel sure that if cosmic theistic evolution is accepted and pushed to its logical results, the Bible as the inspired book of authority in religion will be eliminated.'' Higher criticism, which practically denies the divine authority of the Scriptures, is the theological aspect of evolution. Theistic evolution is the logical starting-point of the system of modern religious liberalism, the theology of which is that of the higher critics, and the practical manifestation of which is socialized Christianity. The tendency of theistic evolution is to the atheistic form, and with this denial of a personal God must logically follow a denial of all miracles

and an inspired Bible. When the Bible is discredited with its divine Christ and salvation through his atonement, the logical consequence is a social gospel.

But the divine authority and full inspiration of the Scriptures have been shown in a previous division, and the historical character of the creation record in Genesis has also been shown. Turning to the Mosaic narrative, we find record of successive creations in progressive order, without one hint of evolution, but rather disproof of it. We admit that the Bible must be interpreted in correspondence with all known facts, but with the evidence that it is God's Word it may be appealed to in refutation of unproved and unprovable theories.

Almost no one, even of theistic evolutionists, believes evolution is taught in the first two chapters of Genesis. Even if evolution were a fact, we readily admit it would probably not have been clearly set forth in a book intended to teach religion in an unscientific age. However, the question is, does the Bible contradict the idea of evolution or may they be harmonized? Evolutionists have often affirmed that the fact of divine creation is declared in Genesis, but that it is not stated whether it was immediate by a divine fiat or mediate and by a process of evolution. But in the account of man's creation, especially that in Genesis 2, the method as well as the fact is stated. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (v. 7). This text represents man, not as descended from the lower animals God had already created, but as an immediate divine creation from inanimate matter by a divine inbreathing. Nothing undignified such as a manipulation of the material is implied in God's formation of man's body. The divine fiat alone was all that was needed.

But that which is most opposed to the idea of man's evolution from the brute is in relation to the creation of Eve. Adam is represented as having been created and as being very good while no female of his species existed. His high dignity was such that among all the beasts was no suitable helpmeet found for him. But if he had been created by a long evolutionary process there must necessarily have been a long line of them reaching up to him and certainly one for him. The mode of Eve's creation as described in Genesis is altogether irreconcilable with evolution.

It is immediate and miraculous creation of the highest order. This account as literal history is regarded as incredible by many evolutionists, but it can be regarded as undeserving of belief only on the ground that all other miracles are incredible. That the apostle Paul accepted this account as literal history is evident from his reference to it in 1 Tim. 2:13: "For Adam was first formed, then Eve."

Another fact of Genesis irreconcilable with evolution is the fall and depravity of the race through Adam. The record of the fall as given in Genesis 3 is more fully described as affecting the race in Romans 5. Such a fall is denied by most theistic evolutionists. Representatives of them attribute man's sinful tendency, not to a moral lapse of the race, but to remaining tendencies of the brute nature from which he has not yet become entirely free. Such a view is not only opposed to the Scriptures, but excludes redemption through Christ's blood.

3. **Facts Reconcilable with Progressive Creation.**—Prof. George Frederick Wright of Oberlin College, who stands in the front rank of modern scientific writers, says in his introduction to "The Other Side of Evolution," by Patterson, "The doctrine of evolution as it is now becoming current in popular literature is one tenth bad science and nine tenths bad philosophy." The unsound reasoning of many evolutionists is especially noticeable in their assumptions that certain facts that agree with their theory prove it and disprove creation. But these facts agree with the idea of progressive creation as truly as with gradual evolution. Evolutionists too often have rashly assumed that creation must necessarily have been instantaneous and complete. Such an assumption is contradictory to the Bible narrative of creation. Progressive creation implies that there were successive creative acts, and that these were from lower to higher forms of existence. Such progressive creation is clearly set forth in the Mosaic record. Evolutionists have assumed that indications of progressive stages from lower to higher forms of life are proof of their theory. But if the six days of creation are understood as geologic ages, which is a very reasonable interpretation, then instead of proving evolution marks of those progressive stages support the Bible teaching of creation.

It has been urged that a gradual evolution of the various living species from lower forms is reasonable to believe because it is

parallel to the gradual development of the inorganic world by which the earth has become a suitable habitation for man, as indicated by geologic formations. In reply, consider first that the parallel is only in the length and gradual nature of the processes. It can not be shown that the process in inorganic nature was by an inherent force without divine direction. Also it is worthy of note that the process was a cooling and, as Professor Fairhurst has stated, a dying process and therefore not parallel with the evolution of living species by resident forces. Especially is the evolutionist's argument groundless because progressive creation of species is also parallel to the gradual formation of the earth. Another argument of evolutionists is the simplicity of the early living forms in comparison with later ones. Here again progressive creation accounts for all the facts as fully as does the theory of evolution.

Again it is urged that the evolutionary hypothesis is supported by the similarities which may be traced, stage by stage, through a large part of the line of organic forms. Doubtless much similarity between species exists, but does such resemblance prove all these animals are therefore genetically connected? Mr. Huxley, who called this the morphological argument, said, "No amount of purely morphological evidence can suffice to prove things came into existence in one way rather than another" (Study of Zoology, p. 86). Is it not reasonable to suppose that things of a class having similar functions to perform should be constructed similarly by an intelligent creator? This very similarity is strong support for the idea of design in creation.

Also it is argued that only evolution of species can account for the existence in the more complex animals of useless parts, which are said to have been used in other species from which the animals are assumed to have evolved. The difficulties in this argument for evolutionists are not a few. They cite the callosities on the leg of the horse as being the remains of thumbs. In the first place they fail to prove they are such. But if they are rudimentary thumbs, is it not reasonable that a divine Creator should carry out a general plan of structure in vertebrates, even though utility in the narrowest sense should not require certain organs? Structures of different classes of things made by men usually conform to a definite type even though often a part useful in some structures has no use whatever in another structure.

Another argument is the resemblance of the embryo of higher forms to the mature phases of lower forms. This point has been much stressed by evolutionists. The idea that the embryo passes through all the changes of its ancestral history is merely an assumption and is coming to be recognized in recent years as less conclusive than was once supposed. Professor Agassiz says, "Anything beyond a general parallelism is hopeless." In his "Evolution of Today," pp. 125, 134, 137, 150, Professor Conn, a recent writer on evolution admits, "Embryology alone is not a safe guide, and only when verified by the fossils can it be relied upon. It seldom gives a true history. . . . The parallel is largely a delusion. . . . It often gives a false history." But regarding man as standing at the top of an ascending order of successive creations, is it unreasonable that the individual embryo should at various stages of its formation bear a general resemblance to the lower species in the advancing order of creation? Is there not here a parallel between progressive creation of species and progress in the formation of an individual of the higher species?

A more popular argument is the efficiency of artificial breeding in producing varieties. But in reply it is well to remember these are only varieties of an already existing species and not new species. Mr. Darwin himself said, "There are two or three million of species on earth—sufficient field, one might think, for observation. But it must be said today that, in spite of all the efforts of trained observers, *not one change of a species into another is on record*" (Life and Letters, Vol. III, p. 25). That no such evolution of a new species has been observed since Darwin wrote is stated by Professor Conn: "It is true enough that naturalists have been unable to find a single unquestioned instance of a new species. . . . It will be admitted at the outset on all sides, that no unquestioned instance has been observed of one species being derived from another. . . . It is therefore impossible at present to place the question beyond dispute" (Evolution of Today, p. 23). Here is a fatal weakness of the evolution theory. The observation of one actual instance of the evolution of a new species would do much to prove the theory, but its ablest advocates admit this is lacking. Therefore the artificial breeding argument for evolution, like all the others, is inconclusive.

4. **Objections to the Evolution Theory.**—Besides the reasons

already given for not accepting evolution is the important one that it is not a fact of science, but only an unproved hypothesis. Huxley said, "After much consideration, and with assuredly no bias against Mr. Darwin's views, it is our clear conviction that as the evidence now stands it is not absolutely proved that a group of animals, having all the characteristics exhibited by species in nature, has ever been originated by selection, whether natural or artificial" (Lay Sermons, 295). That it is still an unproved theory and not science is stated by Alfred Fairhurst, A. M., D. Sc., Professor of Natural Science of the University of Kentucky. "Evolution is not a science; it is only a theory that can not be proved to be true" (Theistic Evolution, p. 49). The wide acceptance of it today is not usually because evidence in support of it appeals to men's reason, but more often because it appeals to their disposition to irreligion or because they are led to suppose all scientists have the proof of it and believe it. The fact is that many leading scientists of the past and of the present have refused to accept evolution.

In his "Theistic Evolution," pp. 69-78, (1919) Professor Fairhurst has quoted among other statements from the following of the world's greatest scientists in which they repudiate the evolution theory: Professor Fleischman, of Erlanger; Professor Zoeckler, of the University of Greifswald; Prof. Whilhelm Wundt, of Liepsic, who stands at the head of German psychologists and who in his early life supported evolution and wrote books in its favor; Dr. Etheridge, of the British Museum, one of England's most famous experts in fossilology; Prof. Lionel S. Beale, physiologist, microscopist, and professor of anatomy and pathology in King's College, London, who stands with Lord Kelvin at the head of English scientists, and in his field is almost without a peer in the world; Professor Virchow, of Berlin, who was styled the "foremost chemist of the globe" and who was the highest German authority in physiology. To these might be added the statements of other eminent scientists, some of whom have been quoted in the foregoing pages.

The following are a few of the positive arguments against evolution:

1. It fails to account for the origin of matter and force. The scientist may answer that it is not within the sphere of the natural scientist to deal with original causes, but only with causes and

phenomena within existing nature. But when evolutionists affirm spontaneous generation they dogmatize about original causes and are out of the realm of science and in that of theology or philosophy. If they so discuss the cause of life, we may rightly demand that they likewise account for the cause of their alleged cause of life—matter and force. Here evolution fails.

2. It fails to account for the origin of life, and confesses that no proof of spontaneous generation exists. If a divine Creator was required to originate life, it is not unreasonable to suppose, as Haeckel said, that all species have been so originated. This objection has been set forth under antitheistic theories.

3. It may be argued against evolution that if species are a result of evolution there must necessarily be at present a great mass of living intermediate or transitional forms as well as fossils of such intermediate links in the chain of existence. But these "missing links," not only between man and lower forms, but between all the millions of living species, which must have existed, on the assumption of slow mutations, are conspicuously absent. Such complete absence is reason for believing they never existed. Also, as an example of another phase of this objection, why do we not find partially developed eyes not yet capable of seeing, as Professor Fairhurst has inquired?

4. Another difficulty for evolution is that individuals of varieties that are the result of artificial breeding are in the fullest degree fertile with individuals of the parent stock or other varieties. This is true of chickens, and if all varieties of chickens were allowed freely to interbreed they would soon lose all distinctiveness and revert to their original type by intercrossing. How then does nature prevent such loss of distinction by intercrossing? The most reasonable view is that these varieties are not distinct species. Variations within species are certain, but the evolving of a new species as is claimed by evolution has never been observed. Species are fixed. The mating of a male and a female of closely related species may result in offspring, as in the case of the mule, which is the hybrid from the crossing of the ass and the mare, but the mating of a male and female mule is always non-productive. Huxley says this infertility is due to the fact that such hybrids are "physiologically imperfect and deficient in the structural parts of the reproductive elements necessary to

generation.'' No true hybrid species has been generated. Only variations within species exist except in the imaginations of uninformed evolutionists.

5. Another difficulty of evolution is so to represent the required elements of the doctrine that they do not contradict one another. Organic nature must be regarded as very plastic to account for the great changes that have occurred. But if living organisms are so disposed to change why has so little change ever actually occurred during the period of observation by men? Dr. H. C. Sheldon, though favoring evolution, admits the difficulty here as follows: ''It suits one demand of evolution doctrine to suppose modifications of organisms to take place with exceeding slowness. When the limited achievements of artificial selection are under review, it is convenient to refer to the immense eons through which nature has wrought out and fixed the various products of her workmanship. On the other hand, when the attention is directed to the absence of intermediate forms in the geological record, it is convenient to assume crises, jumps in nature, or seasons of rapid evolution. Logically the intervention of such seasons or rapid development of permanent varieties, or species, may be conceivable. But if the stimulus of special natural conditions can effect this, the question why the stimulus of artificial conditions can not do more in the production of permanent forms needs to be well answered'' (System of Christian Doctrine, p. 243).

These and other insurmountable obstacles described, especially the absolute incompatibility of the evolutionary hypothesis and the statements of the Bible are deemed sufficient ground on which to repudiate every form of evolution as the method of divine creation.

III. God's Work in Providence

The providence of God may be described as being his preservation of the things he has created and his care for and direction of them to the accomplishment of the ends of their creation. The divine providence is a clearly revealed fact of Holy Scripture. In Heb. 1:3 Christ is said to be ''upholding all things by the word of his power.'' In the prayer in Neh. 9:6 it is said of the heavens, earth, and all therein, ''Thou preservest them all.'' God is said to feed the fowls of the air and to clothe the grass of the field (Matt. 6:26-30). And of his people it is said his

care is so great that he has even the very hairs of their heads all numbered (Matt. 10:30). His providence is universal in its extent.

The providential works of God may be divided into two classes —natural and supernatural, or ordinary and special. By natural providence is meant the operation of God according to the laws of nature. There he always works uniformly. All the working of God is supernatural as to causal efficiency, but there is a clear distinction between his uniform and ordinary operations and his special, miraculous acts in answer to prayer.

1. **Natural Providence.**—God is not only the creator of all things, but is also preserver of those things he has created. Creation is the divine act by which all things are caused to exist, but a continuous agency of God is required for the orderly preservation of those things. Though it has been often assumed that except for the preserving power of God all created substance would fall into nonentity, yet it is questionable whether sound reasoning requires such a conclusion. But a continuous preserving efficiency of God is doubtless requisite to the continuance of substance in orderly forms. In this respect it may be said of all things, "Thou preservest them all."

There is no ground, either Scriptural or rational, for assuming that this preservation is of the nature of a continuous creation, as has been held by Augustine, Aquinas, and some of the New England theologians. According to this theory existing things of the present moment will have dropped out of existence the next moment and will have been supplanted by a new creation. So from the time of the original creation such new creations have appeared continuously differing from the original creation only in resembling and supplanting former existences. Such seems to be the theory in its simplified form. The exact nature of God's method of preserving the universe is beyond the reach of our inspection, but it is doubtless a preservation in a real sense.

In approaching the subject of God's control over nature, the question at once confronts us, does God direct nature by separate volitions and by a power entirely external to it, or does he govern it by general laws and by an efficiency inherent in nature? Is divine providence mediate or immediate? To state the question differently, did God at the time of creation

invest nature with certain forces by which it is operated—did he wind up the universe so it runs of itself, or is all its power the direct working of God's power and is its every movement due to the immediate volition of God's will? That the question is difficult and should not be answered hastily is evident from the fact that the ablest thinkers of various schools of both theological and philosophical thought have differed widely concerning it. If the question is not inscrutable, it is so obscure that dogmatism is improper. But even if we can not fully know the answer to these questions, we may at least understand how to trust in the divine providence, which is the important thing.

A theory held by not a few, including all deists, is that God created physical nature with inherent forces such as gravitation, cohesive attraction, chemical affinity, electricity, and magnetism, which are sufficient of themselves for the operation and guidance of nature, and that God has nothing to do immediately with the question of nature at present, having done all this work at the beginning. This makes his government only mediate. To our thought this theory is inadequate in that it fails to account for facts as we know them. Interpositions of God in both sacred and secular history can not properly be denied. But this theory requires such denial. Another practical objection to it is that it makes no place for trust in providence and is therefore inconsistent with faith and prayer. It removes God so far away that there remains no stimulation to piety.

The opposite theory denies second causes and any essential force in matter, and makes the immediate power of God the sole force in inanimate nature. This view has been held by some eminent thinkers. According to it, matter is entirely forceless. There is no inherent power of gravity in the earth that draws all bodies toward its center, but it is only the occasion for the immediate power of God to force them in that direction. The heavenly bodies are not held in their courses by inherent attraction and centrifugal force, but by the power of God directly manifested which maintains them in such relations as would inherent forces. Lightning does not kill a man, but the direct power of God. The seed is not the cause of the tree, but only the occasion for the divine operation in producing it. Cohesion is not an inherent quality of matter, but par-

ticles adhere to each other because of a direct operation of God in holding them in such relations. This theory also appears to be defective in denying what seems to be the reality of inherent physical forces. But the chief objection to it is the tendency it gives to pantheism and idealism in so closely identifying his working with nature. Also it is liable to beget irreverence because of familiarity with the working of God.

The mode of the divine providence that best agrees with what we know of nature and God as revealed in the Scriptures and his works, partakes of the main idea in both these views. We may well think of God as having invested nature with inherent powers and having determined the mode of their action. These forces operate in harmony with natural laws. On the other hand, we should think of God as everywhere present superintending the operation of these non-intelligent forces and directly cooperating with them to accomplish his high purpose. If God does not thus cooperate with the forces of nature, then the Scripture statements that he feeds the fowls of the air and is aware of the sparrow's fall are meaningless. Such a view allows for a government of the world by general laws and at the same time furnishes ground for the trust of his children in his providence and for supernatural manifestations.

To think of God as directly operative in nature in conjunction with inherent forces is not to deny uniformity of natural law. Such uniformity rather requires divine superintendence and control of natural forces. The idea that direct divine operation in connection with nature must necessarily be capricious and disturbing to uniformity is a groundless assumption. If man can freely act upon nature by employing natural forces, certainly God can do so without causing disorder. By the use of natural forces men overcome the power of gravity by flying in an aeroplane, but this does not constitute an interruption of uniformity in nature. Is the power of the Infinite so limited by his own laws that he can not act freely on nature as do his rational creatures? If so then trust in providence is unreasonable, revelation is impossible, prayer can have no efficiency, and religion in its highest form is a superstition.

But the uniformity of the operation of nature is a fact, and can be accounted for only on the ground of the direct superintendence of God over natural forces. This uniformity is

necessary and doubtless exists for the well-being of sentient creatures. Except for the uniform movements of the earth in relation to the sun, life on the earth would soon be extinct. The uniformity of gravity is essential to man's life and all his doings. If food sometimes nourished and sometimes poisoned the body, if the heart pulsated or the lungs respired only at times and not regularly, life would be impossible. Therefore general uniformity in nature is necessary to the existence of living creatures. The direct operation of God in nature must be generally uniform.

In the realm of living organisms as well as in lower nature is to be found inherent force, but here also a direct divine superintendence is necessary to the perpetuation of life through those forces. Life is not self-sufficient. It is because of this immediate directive agency of God in maintaining life that the Scriptures declare not one sparrow shall fall on the ground without your Father. With all due allowance for inherent forces in nature, yet it may be held that in a very real sense God clothes the grass of the field, and feeds the fowls of the air. His directing agency permeates all his works. By his potential omnipresence he is everywhere to know and to do. Such a view of God in relation to the world agrees with all we know of God from Revelation and nature, and is conducive to piety by representing the benefits that come to us as the result of his immediate working. To suppose God's agency in providing for us occurred millions of years ago and that all our good things are directly the product of blind non-intelligent forces is, to say the least, not likely to stir in us any emotions of gratitude. But to think of God as now guiding all his works, brings him near us and is important to that attitude of worshipful dependence that holds so large a place in true religion.

2. **Supernatural Providence.**—In the light of what has already been said, it is evident that all providence is in some sense supernatural. A distinction may be made, however, between that ordinary and uniform operation of God in connection with the laws of nature by which he feeds the fowls of the air, and his special working in protecting from harm by accident or in supplying a special need of one of his righteous children who definitely trusts him for such benefits. Special, or supernatural, providence also includes those blessings that are received in

answer to prayer as well as all miracles. All benefits that do not come to us through natural processes may well be termed supernatural.

The Scriptures in every part clearly teach such a special divine care and blessing of the righteous because they are righteous. "O fear the Lord, ye his saints: for there is no want to them that fear him. The young lions do lack, and suffer hunger: but they that seek the Lord shall not want any good thing" (Psa. 34:9, 10). "Trust in the Lord, and do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed" (Psa. 37:3). "He will fulfil the desire of them that fear him" (Psa. 145:19). "I have been young, and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread" (Psa. 37:25). "But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt. 6:33). "But my God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus" (Phil. 4:19). This very common teaching of the Scriptures is corroborated by the feeling of dependence of the righteous and the cravings of the Christian consciousness for divine care and guidance. Also it is the common experience of the most devout Christians that God does thus care especially for them. One of the most comforting thoughts to the godly is that "all things work together for good to them that love God."

But by what method does God especially protect and help the righteous? How can he specially operate to benefit the righteous without throwing nature into disorder or interfering with the uniformity of it? The difficulties here are not so great as the antisupernaturalist assumes. God's special care for the righteous may be through the exercise of divine power independently of and superior to his ordinary works in nature—or by miracles. But supernatural providence is probably more often exercised in the realm of mind than by a miraculous changing of physical nature. By what mode God presents ideas directly to the consciousness of men is inscrutable, but that he does so cause us to know certain things and does influence our thought is evident from both the Bible and experience.

By such divine influence on men's minds they may be led to do such things as will be for their good. This is probably the most common method of providential guidance in the affairs

of life. In such a case there is a supernatural providence though it may not be distinguished as such. Divine action in the realm of mind may also result in other supernatural benefits. A minister who had no income except free-will offerings needed a certain amount of money for a particular purpose. A person who could not possibly have known about his need handed to him at the very time it was needed the exact amount required and remarked that he had been impressed to give it to the minister. This and numberless similar occurrences must be attributed to supernatural providence acting in the realm of mind. Christians may be supernaturally prospered in business by the same method. The thoughts of the farmer may be divinely directed so he will plant and reap at opportune times. Buyers may be likewise influenced to purchase their supplies from a Christian merchant whom God would prosper. A certain Christian intended taking a certain ship for an ocean voyage, but at the last moment decided to wait for a later ship and by so doing was spared while the first ship and all on board were lost. These and many similar events are examples of supernatural providence. The destruction by a storm at sea of the Spanish Armada, which was sent out to destroy Protestant England, did not necessarily require a divine intervention in physical nature, but only such an influencing of the mind of the commander of the fleet in regard to the time of its sailing as would cause it to be at the place where it was lost when that particular storm occurred. Evidently supernatural providence does operate in the realm of mind, but it is not therefore to be assumed that divine interposition never occurs in physical nature.

Prayer must also be allowed a large place in connection with supernatural providence. Deists and all who deny God's personality recognize no objective value of prayer. But the impulse to pray is deeply implanted in the race, and there is implied in it an expectation of answers to prayer. The Scriptures clearly teach that God answers prayer and that to ask for those things he needs is the privilege of the Christian. "Be careful for nothing; but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God" (Phil. 4:6). "What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them"

(Mark 11:24). And not only does the Bible furnish us with many such promises, but it also abounds with records of the fulfilment of them in definite answers to prayer. Fire fell from heaven on Jehovah's altar in response to a simple prayer by Elijah the prophet, and later when he prayed for rain the drought of three years and six months was ended promptly by a great rain.

No grander privilege is offered to men than that of prayer. Nothing brings greater joy to the devout soul nor awakens in him a deeper love for God than to experience a definite answer to his own believing petition. Such answers to prayer are the most impressive of all providential manifestations.

It is not to be assumed, however, that everything which the Christian asks of God will be granted. God's promises are conditioned by his will. He will not do what is inconsistent with his character and his plan. A Christian's prayer for the pardon of an impenitent sinner acquaintance could not be answered because it would be a violation of God's own holiness. Neither could God consistently grant a petition of one who should ask to be allowed to remain alive on earth forever, because such would be contradictory to God's plan. Also God will not answer prayer if such would conflict with his plan for the one who prays. For this reason Jesus' prayer for the passing of his cup of suffering and Paul's for the removal of the thorn in his flesh were not granted, though each prayed three times. The salvation of men necessitated Jesus' sufferings, and Paul's moral welfare and usefulness required that he endure his thorn, but each was granted sustaining grace. But with all these limitations there still remains a large place for providential blessings through prayer.

The objection is sometimes urged that God's omniscience makes prayer needless and useless. This would indeed be true if the purpose of prayer were to inform God of our needs and desires. But God knows our needs and if their supply were the highest end, then we could assume his goodness would prompt him to grant them. But for the development of piety in men, that the reception of blessings might awaken gratitude, and that men might feel their dependence upon God, he withholds some benefits until earnest petition is made for them. The objection to divine answers to prayer on the ground of God's immuta-

bility is based on a false sense of his unchangeableness. He is immutable only in his essential character, not in the sense that he can not act freely in harmony with his character. No objection to miracles, or special operations of God in nature, is valid in view of his free personality and direct superintendence of the operation of natural forces.

A common objection, not only to providential blessings through prayer, but to all providence is the existence of the various ills of life. Why does God not always answer the prayers of the godly? Why does he allow the righteous to suffer? Why does he not banish sickness, pain, and death? Why did he create some animals to prey upon others? And why, if he superintends natural forces, does he allow destructive earthquakes, storms, and floods? Some of these questions may be readily answered. Others may be unanswerable in the present state of our knowledge. This is especially true of suffering among lower animals. But no difficulties thus remaining can overthrow the sure evidence we have of God's providential care over his works.

The fact of present probation accounts for much of the suffering of the present. It is necessary to develop moral excellence in men. Their souls are ennobled through suffering. Therefore God can not always consistently answer prayer for deliverance from it. But "we know that all things work together for good to them that love God." Suffering may be for the purpose of correction for the righteous, but especially for the wicked. It may serve to deter others from moral evil, and in its punitive aspect may serve to uphold God's holiness. God permits the forces inherent in nature to bring suffering and death to righteous and wicked. Suffering from such sources is usually more impressive, but is by God's permissive will as is suffering from disease. No such suffering disproves God's control in nature. It is punishment to the wicked and is for the spiritual well-being of the righteous. It is the "chastening of the Lord" if we are righteous and is for "our profit." The Christian knows by his own past experience as well as that of others, especially such ancient godly men as Joseph, Job, Moses, and Paul, that suffering does yield rich reward, and therefore counts it all joy when he meets it.

Whatever difficulties attend belief in providence, they are

insignificant in comparison with those attendant upon its denial. Atheism furnishes no advantage. A certain degree of obscurity concerning God's methods is necessary to present probation, but the devout are comforted with a blessed assurance that when the morning of that future day shall break they shall see clearly that God has done all things well.

IV. Angels

1. **Existence and Nature of Angels.**—Frequently mentioned in the Scriptures are a class of created, finite beings called angels, who are superior to human beings. The reality of such an order of beings has been generally believed. The belief is not only supported by the Scriptures, but the existence of such a class of beings is rationally probable. Such beings in another world are even conceivable on the theory of evolution. No reason can be given for assuming that men are the most exalted nor the full measure of rational creation. As the earth is but a mere speck in comparison with the physical universe so is it not reasonable to assume that the rational creatures on the earth are similarly a small proportion of all rational creatures? Man is the lowest rational being we know. Is it not probable other rational creatures of a higher order exist?

Angels are not merely figurative, without any real existence, as modern rationalism assumes. Jesus recognized their actual existence in his answer to the Sadducees, the Jewish rationalists of his time. But the repudiation of the rationalistic denial of angelic existences does not require that we admit the various scholastic subtleties that were connected with the doctrine in the Medieval Ages and which have led to a reaction in a depreciation of the truth concerning angels that is given in the Bible. Though the Bible frequently mentions angels, yet it does so only for practical purposes and in connection with the subject of men's salvation. It has no interest in angels for their own sake, as it has not in the physical universe or the creation of organic nature. The Bible is anthropocentric—its interest is man and his redemption. Therefore we should not expect it to give information concerning many points relative to angels that claim our interest.

That angels are spirits is certain (Heb. 1:7). It is usually understood that they are pure spirits without corporeity—

similar in this respect to God. But of this we can not be absolutely sure. A council held at Nice in 784 held that they possessed bodies of ether or light, but the later Council of Lateran affirmed that they were pure spirits. Mark 12:25 has been sometimes regarded as ground for supposing they have such bodies as resurrected human bodies will be, but the text does not require such an interpretation. All the appearances of angels mentioned in the Bible may be regarded as voluntary manifestations, as are theophanies, and not indicative of their essential nature. If they have no material being, the representations of them with wings in visions and types should not be regarded as according to their real nature.

They are not eternal nor infinite in any respect. They began to exist by means of divine creation (Heb. 1:7). When they were created we are not told. It is certain they not only antedate man, but also that they had already been created when the foundations of the earth were laid (Job 38:4-7). It is possible they existed before all material substance if we suppose the term "beginning" in Gen. 1:1 includes only the beginning of matter. "They neither marry, nor are given in marriage" (Matt. 22:30); consequently they do not propagate their kind. Therefore they are not a race, but an order of beings. Though they are not eternal in that they have not always existed, yet they will always exist in the future because essentially immortal. "Neither can they die" (Luke 20:36). Man was created lower than the angels, because he was made subject to death (Heb. 2:7, 9). Their number is forever fixed except God create others.

Though the powers of angels are not infinite, yet they are far greater than those of men. "They are greater in power and might" than are we. They "excel in strength." They can communicate with one another and to other intelligences. Their power extends to both matter and mind. An angel announced the birth of Christ to the shepherds. One rolled back the stone from the entrance to Jesus' tomb when he rose from the dead. The angel who delivered Peter from prison had superhuman power to cause the chains to fall off him and to open the securely fastened iron gate. Their knowledge is also far greater than is man's, though not without limit. We have no way of knowing what is the mode and full extent of their knowledge. While they are certainly not omnipresent either essentially or

potentially, yet their power of rapid movement from place to place is inconceivably great, because at the time of his apprehension in Gethsemane Jesus said to Peter, "Thinkest thou that I can not now pray to my Father, and he shall *presently give* me more than twelve legions of angels?" The implication seems to be that they can move from place to place instantaneously.

Angels are also moral beings and are divided into two classes, good and evil. With the several foregoing qualities they must also possess personality in the truest sense. Personality is implied in their being spirits. Their seeking knowledge (1 Peter 1:12), feeling "joy," and performing acts, is evidence that they have all the constituent qualities of personality—intellect, sensibility, and will. The subject is alluring to the imagination and much might be inferred, but certain knowledge of the nature of higher rational creatures extends but little beyond the foregoing.

They have no power over men except it is divinely given. Therefore they are not to be feared because of any harm that they might do to us nor worshiped because of any good that comes to us by their agency. In no instance do holy angels accept worship from men, but exhort to "worship God."

2. **Good Angels.**—These are called "holy angels." Their being so designated is probably not due merely to their having been so created, but especially to their faithfully enduring a period of probation and to their now being confirmed in holiness. They obey God perfectly (Matt. 6:10). How many of these God has created we do not know. It is clear, however, that their number is very great. Jesus said he could have twelve legions of angels to protect him. Counting according to the greater Roman legion this would be seventy-two thousands. But Jesus more probably intended to express the idea of a great number. In Dan. 7:10 God is represented as ministered to by millions and with one hundred million standing before him. The writer to the Hebrews mentions "an innumerable company of angels." No reason can be given why they may not be so many that their number is literally incomprehensible to us. A certain gradation and organization exists among them. This appears from their having thrones, dominions, prin-

cipalities, and powers (Col. 1:16). Michael is represented in the Scriptures as the archangel.

Angels are described as being especially devoted to the worship of God (Isa. 6:2-4). They are represented in the Scriptures as being especially employed in helping God's people. "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" (Heb. 1:14). Doubtless in relation to man this is their office. Certainly it is not to rule over him. But because of the anthropocentric character of the Scriptures we should not suppose this is their sole employment nor even their main work. What is their employment in heaven is unknown to us, but it may be supposed it is some form of loving service becoming to their holy natures.

They ministered to the patriarchs as messengers from God (Gen. 18:2; 19:15). The law at Sinai was given to Israel through their agency (Heb. 2:2). Through them messages were given to the prophets (Dan. 9:21). They also predicted and celebrated the birth of Christ (Luke 1:11; 2:9). They strengthened Jesus after the temptation in the wilderness and after the agony in Gethsemane. They announced Jesus' resurrection and comforted the disciples at the ascension. They bore the soul of the beggar, Lazarus, to paradise. They are also to attend Christ at his second coming.

Jesus said of little children, "Their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." This has been made the ground of the theory that each child and each of God's people has a particular guardian angel. The Bible gives no support to such an idea. When the damsel Rhoda stedfastly affirmed that Peter stood at the gate of Mary's home when he was delivered from prison, the people said, "It is his angel." This has been supposed to uphold the theory of a particular guardian angel. But it was not originally inspired and should be regarded as no more than an idea common among the Jews. While the Bible does not support the idea of a particular guardian angel for each righteous person, yet it does give the blessed assurance that "the angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them" (Psa. 34:7). Many other texts teach that these holy beings are about us in times of danger and trouble, and also at the hour of death.

3. **Evil Angels.**—Divine revelation also teaches the existence

of evil angels whose intense malignity against God causes them to oppose his operations for men's welfare by tempting men to oppose themselves to his holy will. The existence of such beings is rationally possible and is usually denied only by those denying good angels also. How beings so vile came to be has been a matter of much inquiry. They must either be eternal or else were divinely created. It has usually been assumed that only God is eternal. "By him were *all things* created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible" (Col. 1:16). This text is fairly good ground for supposing evil angels are not eternal, but created of God. But it is inconceivable that the holy God would create vile beings. Therefore he must have created them holy and they became sinful in character by their own acts, as has man.

An apostasy of angels is clearly stated in the Bible. "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment" (2 Peter 2:4). "The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day" (Jude 6). Angels were at one time all holy and on probation. Some sinned and lost their holy estate. What was the nature of their sin is not stated. It has been supposed from 1 Tim. 3:6, that it was pride and self-exaltation. The "condemnation of the devil" is supposed to mean the condemnation he incurred by his sin. These sinful angels are usually supposed to be identical with the devil and his angels. As sinful men are opposed to the kingdom of righteousness so are these sinful angels. Of the time when they sinned we only know it was anterior to man's apostasy.

The evil spirits are designated "devils" in the common English Version of the New Testament, but are more correctly called "demons" in the Revised Version. One evil spirit is superior in rank and power to the others. He is called Beelzebub, the prince of devils; Satan, the adversary; the devil or the slanderer; the evil one; the prince of darkness; Belial; and the tempter. The number of the demons is great. Jesus cast seven demons out of Mary Magdalene. The Gadarene demoniac is represented as possessed of a legion or a great multitude of

them. They were numerous enough to cause the drowning of two thousand swine into whom they had entered.

The general nature and powers of demons are similar to those of holy angels. They are of greater power and knowledge than men. Satan, it appears, is superior in power to the demons over whom he is ruler, but there is no reason for assuming he is all powerful, omniscient, or omnipresent. It is certain God has greater power from the fact that Satan could tempt Job only by divine permission. Also God will not suffer us to be tempted above that we are able to bear (1 Cor. 10:13). The limitation of Satan's knowledge is evident from his failure to know that Job would endure his trial. If he had foreknowledge of the actions of free beings, he would have no occasion to tempt those who will not yield, as in Christ's temptation in the wilderness. But that even the demons have superhuman knowledge is shown by their immediate recognition of Jesus' divinity when he approached them. Though not omnipresent, yet Satan may possess the power of instantaneous movement from place to place. Also it is possible that he could work in many places simultaneously through the demons as agents. Probably no salvation is now provided for demons, although it is possible that it was once offered to them.

Satan and demons are employed exclusively, as far as is revealed, in opposing God's moral government. Satan tempted Eve in Eden under the guise of a serpent. He also tempted Job and Jesus. He sows the tares in men's hearts to hinder the gospel and catches away the good seed of God's Word. He entices men through physical desires and otherwise. What is the mode by which he has access to men's minds to tempt them is not stated in the Bible, but it is probably by direct influence over the mind as is the usual method of the Holy Spirit. "Why does God not kill the devil?" was the question of the Indian to Eliot, and it is often asked today. Why God allows Satan to continue to endeavor to turn men from God is probably not altogether answerable. It may be answered in a measure by asking another question, Why does God not annihilate wicked men? Doubtless it is proper in his wisdom that apostate free beings should be allowed to choose their course. Also God is doubtless more glorified by the preservation of the righteous

amidst such temptations and by their faithful endurance of temptations.

4. **Demon Possession.**—The possession and control of men by a demon spirit is not a rational impossibility. As the human spirit dwells in and operates the body, so it is conceivable that a demon may do so. As the Holy Spirit of God dwells in and acts on man's body and mind, so may a demon spirit. If the human spirit of the hypnotist is able so to control another human being that the spirit of the second becomes dormant while the former acts upon it and controls its body, may not a demon spirit do likewise?

The fact of demon possession is clearly set forth in the Bible. Jesus and the apostles often met or had brought to them demoniacs. The demons sometimes spoke in their own persons and Jesus' replies were spoken directly to them and not to the person possessed. Examples of this are the Gadarene demoniacs (Matt. 8:28; Mark 5:1). The objections to the reality of these being actually possessed is usually based on the denial of the existence of demons. Attempts have been made to account for the phenomena of demoniac possession on psychological grounds, on pathological grounds as being a result of nervous disorders, and on evolutionary grounds. But these theories are all entirely inadequate and unsatisfactory in the light of the facts.

Jesus strongly upheld the belief in demon possession. The objection that he was ignorant of the facts is incompatible with his divinity and is acceptable only to unbelievers. The theory that Jesus knew demon possession was not actual and merely accommodated his words to a prevalent erroneous view makes him who was the Truth a deceiver and represents him as conversing with mere diseases and basing the claim of his divinity on a mere false pretension of casting out evil spirits.

The belief in demon possession is not peculiar to Christianity. It was common among the Jews in Christ's time, and has been generally believed in all countries and all ages. In other parts of the Roman Empire than Palestine it was recognized (Acts 16:16). Dr. J. L. Nevius in his excellent work "Demon Possession and Allied Themes" has cited many instances in detail and described the general belief in it in various parts of China, in Japan, in India (especially among the demonolaters), and in other lands in the past and present.

From the Scripture accounts of demon-possessed persons and also from present-day examples we may know many facts concerning demon possession. The demon spirit bears a relation to the body of the demoniac not very different from that which is normal to the human spirit. It controls the possessed person directly. Either at times or constantly the human spirit is dormant and the demon is in control. At such times it will speak in its own person through the vocal organs of the person possessed, but often in a strange voice and will manifest superhuman physical strength. Sometimes loud cries are uttered (Mark 9:26). Extreme fierceness in some cases, even attempts to murder, is another manifestation (Matt. 8:28). Other accompaniments are sounds similar to barking, hissing, croaking, choking, growling, grunting, also shaking, fainting, and awful contortions of the body and especially the face. The demon sometimes seeks to destroy the body possessed (Matt. 17:15), or afflicts it—sometimes with dumbness (Matt. 9:32), blindness (Matt. 12:22), deafness (Mark 9:25), or epilepsy (Mark 9:18). Sometimes insanity results (Matt. 17:15). An unclean demon will sometimes use extremely obscene language. The subject feels bound and tormented by the demon. However, he may have special miraculous powers in fortune-telling and healing the sick (Acts 16:16). Outward manifestations are most common when the demoniac comes under religious influence—especially when earnest, believing prayer is offered. Evidence of demon possession is frequently so clear that no divine power of discernment is needed to know it is such, and even those not Christians will recognize it.

Persons most liable to be possessed are spiritualistic mediums or those otherwise connected with spiritualism. It is common with heathen priests and seems to be more common in heathen than in Christian lands. Demon possession is not limited to persons of weak minds, but those of culture may become possessed. Sometimes it comes on one much as a physical malady in that it is in disregard of moral character. Persons of clean outward life may become possessed. Even children may be possessed (Mark 9:21). In some instances it seems to assume the character of an affliction for which one is not responsible and which does not affect the soul's relation to God. In such

cases possession takes place without choice on the subject's part, but ordinarily it is by his voluntary choice.

Demons are exorcised, or cast out, by various methods. Heathen methods consist in beating, burning, or otherwise inflicting physical suffering on the body of the subject. Such may have been the usual method of the seven sons of Sceva, the Jew, who were professional exorcists (Acts 19:14). Such methods appear to be effective in certain cases. It is conceivable that the demon spirit when in control bears such a relation to the human body possessed that it feels that pain inflicted and is thus forced to depart. Sometimes the spirit is persuaded to leave by promises of worship by the subject. Faith in the name of Jesus is the Christian method of expelling demons and is effective today as in the days of early Christianity. Usually prayer is offered and those praying lay their hands on the person possessed. Fasting is sometimes necessary (Matt. 17:21).

PART IV

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN, OR ANTHROPOLOGY

PART IV

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN, OR ANTHROPOLOGY

Chapter I

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF MAN

The term anthropology is derived from the Greek words ἄνθρωπος (*anthropos*), man, and λόγος (*logos*), science; therefore it means the science about man. In its broadest sense it includes all branches of science relating to man's body and mind as well as that which has to do with his religious nature. Biblical anthropology, of which Christian theology treats, has for its principal subject man's moral and religious nature.

The Scriptures ever keep the religious aspect foremost in all they say about man. They concern themselves with his origin and physical and intellectual constitution only as such facts contribute to true religion. But it is necessary to know somewhat of man's original nature properly to understand redemption through Christ. The purpose of theology, then, is to show what man was originally by creation, for the purpose of showing what he has become by the fall and what is needed for his redemption. Our idea of salvation is determined by the particular anthropology we hold. If the moral fall of the race is denied, consistency requires also a denial of regeneration. If man were regarded as at present totally depraved so he can will nothing good, then salvation would be monergistic, as pure Calvinism affirms; that is the individual's salvation would depend entirely on God's operation to save him and in no wise upon his own free choice.

The origin of man is declared by the Bible to have been by divine creation. "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him" (Gen. 1:27). Man is not a result either directly or indirectly of spontaneous generation. Neither is he the product of the divine operation by a process of evolution from lower forms. Man is neither *from* the brute, as naturalistic evolutionists affirm, nor *through* the brute, as is held by theistic evolutionists. Evolution has been sufficiently

discussed as an antitheistic theory and as a theory of creation; so further consideration of it here is superfluous.

But the important fact for religion is that man owes his origin to God. This is the ground for his obligation to serve God. Because men owe everything, including existence itself, to God, they can not justly withhold anything from him. He deserves their utmost obedience and worship. They ought to love him with all their powers. They can not reasonably do otherwise. But it is only on the ground of his being their creator that God can justly require such absolute submission and service. If he were not their creator such a demand would be a usurpation of a power and place in relation to men wholly unjustifiable. Divine creation of men is fundamental to religion among them. Also it is this sonship by creation that qualifies men for spiritual sonship through Christ. Man was created in God's image, which he has lost; therefore in the new creation through Christ he is restored to that which originally was his state.

I. Unity of the Race

By the unity of the human race is meant that all mankind descended from a single original pair. On the fact of the oneness of the race rests the Bible doctrine of human depravity and sin. This moral perversion of the race is fundamental in Christian doctrine, and is the ground of man's need of redemption through Christ. "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous" (Rom. 5:19). The first step in proving the unity of mankind is to determine the time of man's origin, for it is said the great differences between the races necessarily required a long time in which to be developed.

1. **Antiquity of the Race.**—The length of time which has elapsed since the appearance of man on the earth has come in recent years to be a topic of special interest concerning which no little difference of opinion prevails. With the advancement of science, especially of geology, the tendency has been to claim a much higher antiquity for the race than was formerly allowed. The most commonly accepted Biblical chronology makes the time from Adam to Christ but 4,004 years. But the most moderate claims of scientists exceed this hundreds or even thousands of years. Also it is alleged that the unity of the race can be

maintained only on the assumption of a greater antiquity for man than 4,004 B. C. Can the Bible be reconciled with these claims?

Nowhere does the Bible state the time of man's origin. The Bible gives no chronology. It is true that individuals have often been very dogmatic concerning the exact date of certain events described in the Scriptures, but the fact remains as stated by Le Hir and De Sacy, "There is no Biblical chronology." No fewer than one hundred and eighty different calculations of the length of the period from Adam to Christ have been set forth by Jewish and Christian writers, ranging from 3,483 years up to 6,984 years. So uncertain are all attempts to determine the chronology of the Bible. Therefore believers in the Bible need have no fear of its being contradicted by the facts of science concerning the age of man. If it can be shown that he has been on the earth for eight or ten thousand years, or even longer, the devout believer in the Bible need have no uneasiness, for the Bible affirms nothing to the contrary.

The various schemes of Bible chronology are based upon the tables of genealogies given at different places in the Scriptures, by adding together the ages of the fathers at the time the sons were born. This method might give a correct chronology if all the links of the genealogical chain were given, but of the latter we have no assurance. These tables were not written for the purpose of determining dates of events, but to show that Christ was the Son of David, of the seed of Abraham, and the promised seed of the woman that would bruise the head of the serpent. Also another element of uncertainty is the difference in ages of the patriarchs as given in the Hebrew text and that of the Septuagint. According to the former, which is that of our common English Bibles, the period from Adam to Christ was about four thousand years, but the figures given in the Septuagint make it nearly six thousand years.

The incompleteness of the genealogical tables is probable. They were given to show only the line of descent, not a complete list of births in a particular line; consequently there was no necessity of completeness. On this subject Dr. Hodge quotes from Green as follows: "Thus in Genesis 46:18, after recording the sons of Zilpah, her grandsons and her great-grandsons, the writer adds, 'These are the sons of Zilpah . . . and these she

bare unto Jacob, even sixteen souls.' The same thing recurs in the case of Bilhah, verse 25, 'She bare these unto Jacob: all the souls were seven.' Compare, verses 15, 22. No one can pretend that the author of this register did not use the term understandingly of descendants beyond the first generation. In like manner, according to Matt. 1:11, Josias begat his grandson Jechonias, and verse 8, Joram begat his great-grandson Ozias. And in Genesis 10:15-18, Canaan, the grandson of Noah, is said to have begotten several whole nations, the Jebusite, the Amorite, the Girgashite, the Hivite, etc., etc. Nothing can be plainer, therefore, than that in the usage of the Bible 'to bear' and 'to beget' are used in a wide sense to indicate descent, without restricting this to the immediate offspring'' (Systematic Theology, Vol. II, pp. 40, 41). On the assumption of these missing links the Biblical chronology allows for whatever the facts of science require.

But a clear distinction should be made between what the facts of science require and what a certain class of scientists claim. Those who assume man is a product of a process of evolution unite in claiming for him an antiquity of from one hundred thousand years to a million years or even much more. But such a high antiquity for man is not required by discoveries of archeologic geology or other evidence, but is held especially because it is a necessary assumption of their theory of evolution. Any theory of evolution must allow such long ages for a change so great as that which differentiates man from the brute. However, attempts are made to support the view of a great age for man by appeals to the great antiquity of certain nations, and especially to fossil remains of man or other facts indicative of his presence, such as flint instruments deeply buried under drift deposits which are supposed to have required very long periods for accumulation. Also it is reasoned that those characteristics in color and feature which differentiate the races and the large number of languages must have required a very long time for development.

That these facts do not require the great antiquity for man assumed by evolutionists is declared by some very eminent scientists. Those who hold a great age for man have often been convicted of reasoning unsoundly from the facts on which they base their arguments. Space forbids a review and refutation

of their arguments, but the following testimony of high authorities in science is sufficient ground for holding a comparatively brief period for human existence on the earth.

Prof. Alexander Winchell says, "Man has no place till after the reign of ice. It has been imagined that the close of the reign of ice dates back perhaps a hundred thousand years. There is no evidence of this. The fact is that we ourselves came upon the earth in time to witness the retreat of the glaciers. They still linger in the valleys of the Alps and along the northern shores of Europe and Asia. The fact is we are not so far out of the dust, chaos, and barbarism of antiquity as we had supposed. The very beginnings of our race are almost in sight. Geological events which, from the force of habit in considering them, we had imagined to be located far back in the history of things, are found to have transpired at our very doors."

Prof. Geo. Frederick Wright, an authority on the glacial period than whom there is no higher, has reached the conclusion that it ended not earlier than from seven to ten thousand years ago. Professor Holmes says the great ice sheet did not disappear until about ten thousand years ago. Such recent American geologists as Professor Salisbury and Dr. Upham think that seven to ten thousand years is a fair estimate. Other names might be added.

If we add to these estimates of seven thousand to ten thousand years for the close of the ice age the testimony of careful geologists that no traces of man are found before the glacial period and not until near its close, we have no facts from geology for supposing man has been on the earth more than eight thousand years to ten thousand years. Without allowing for any missing links in the genealogies the longer chronology from the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament requires nearly eight thousand years for the age of man. But as has been shown, missing links are not at all improbable. Admitting a few of these gives us a Biblical chronology that dates man's origin ten thousand years ago, which is as much as is required by any historical or scientific fact known. The Bible chronology may be extended, without any straining of facts, to agree with all for which we are required to give account.

2. **Problem of Race Distinctions and Unity.**—The characteristics which differentiate the various branches of the human race are

very marked and persistent. Doubtless the greatest differences exist between the Caucasian and Negroid peoples. The contrast is especially noticeable in the ruddy skin, the straight, round hair, high forehead, thin lips, and prominent nose of the former and the black skin, flat, kinked hair, sloping forehead, thick lips, and flat nose which usually characterize the latter. The question which confronts us in relation to these distinctions is, are these various races distinct species of men with different origins, or are they only variations within one species, similar to those distinctions between varieties of single species of fowls or beasts that are the result of selective artificial breeding? The proof that they are a single species from an original pair is important to theology both for apologetics and in support of universal depravity and redemption through Christ. The affirmations by the Scriptures of man's unity is sufficient ground for belief of it, but because of those who oppose these declarations it is well that we answer their objections.

A distinction is conceivable between oneness of origin of the race and oneness of species. Such a distinction, however, is dependent upon the sense in which species is understood, and many different definitions of species have been given by scientists. It is possible that in the original creation God caused a particular kind of grass to grow out of the ground to carpet the earth in many different places all bearing seed and constituting a single species. If this were true, then a single species may have a plurality of origins. The possibility of the human race being a simple species with several origins has been not a little discussed in recent years. Agassiz, who was very prominent in science, held this theory. It represents the extreme of supernaturalism, and has been held by some on Biblical grounds. It assumes other families of human beings than that descended from Adam. Especially does it suppose there was one or more pre-Adamite races, and attempts to support the theory with various statements from the Bible. However, the pre-Adamic theory is not essential to a reasonable interpretation of all the texts that are connected with it, and moreover it is contradictory to other clear texts (Acts 17:26; Rom. 5:12).

A plurality of origins for mankind has been held as a ground for the distinctions of the various races of men. But these distinctions may be satisfactorily accounted for otherwise. The

Bible teaches that all men are descended from a single pair and science furnishes no reason for a contrary view. In fact, science is not properly concerned with the question of origins. But it does show oneness of the human species and thus makes a place for the more advanced idea taught in the Bible that all men had a single origin. There is no disagreement between science and revelation on the subject, and as far as science can go it supports the statements of the Scriptures.

The very idea of a species is commonly understood to imply descent from a single source. A species, according to Quatrefages, is defined as follows: "Species is a collection of individuals more or less resembling each other, which may be regarded as having descended from a single primitive pair by an uninterrupted and natural succession of families" (The Human Species, p. 36). Species then implies certain resemblance among its members, but especially the family idea, which includes the capacity for interbreeding of its members indefinitely. In this sense the human beings are one species even if it could be proved that they were not from a single original pair. But if they could not be shown to be a single species, then would be lacking a chief ground in support of the Scripture teaching of unity of origin of the race. This unity of the race may be shown by different methods of reasoning.

3. **Physiological Argument.**—Different varieties of a particular species may exhibit much difference in color, size, and shape. Such differences are common in different varieties of dogs, horses, cattle, or chickens. Yet these differences, though so noticeable, are yet found on closer study to be but superficial. In all such species the similarities between varieties are many times more numerous, far deeper, and more abiding than any of the marked differences mentioned. For example, among dogs the great mastiff and the little Scotch terrier exhibit marked contrast in size. Also one may be black and the other white, one may have short hair and the other long hair, and they may differ much in relative proportion of parts and general habits. Yet in the number, general shape, and structure of their bones, and in their joints, in the structure of their muscles, and in the distribution of nerves and blood-vessels they are the same. They are both dogs and unhesitatingly recognize each other as such.

The various races of the human species are not nearly so

different as are the varieties of the several species of lower animals that have been before mentioned. The difference in color between the black skin of the African and the ruddy complexion of the inhabitant of northern Europe is not nearly so great as that between certain varieties of dogs where one is jet black and the other white as snow. Neither is the difference in the shape of the skull in the Caucasian and Negroid so great as that between the shape of the skull of the greyhound and the bulldog. The flat nose and thick lips of the African are greatly in contrast with those of the typical European, but the difference is much greater between the upright pointed ears of the bull-terrier and the long lopping ears of the dachshund.

Yet we know these differences in varieties of lower animals are largely the result of mere artificial breeding and mutations and are not indicative of distinction of species, but only of varieties or developments in species. Is it any less reasonable to regard the different races of men as being varieties of a single species? Just what were the causes that led to the distinctions of the races is probably not knowable to us, but that climatic conditions, modes of life, sudden variations in types of ancestors, and other similar causes could result in such permanent differences in the course of many centuries is easily believable. Certain tribes of North America have permanently altered the shape of the skull by bandaging the head in infancy. According to Dr. A. H. Strong, the Sikhs of India, by the acceptance of a new religion and a consequent advance in civilization, have changed the shape of their heads. Other similar examples are also cited. Surely those facts from which the evolutionist endeavors to show an evolution of all living species from a simple organism are sufficient to account for the variations among the races of man even if they do fall short of proving what they are assumed to prove.

But the most certain positive evidence that all human races are of one species is the absence of hybridity. The union of the sexes of the most diverse race is as fruitful as any within a particular race, and the offspring of such mating is in no degree infertile. The evidence of this is so plentiful that the statement of the fact is superfluous. But the sexual union of distinct species is unfruitful except in cases of very similar species, and then the offspring is infertile, which is certainly not true of the

mulatto. This fact of hybridity is a great law of nature and is regarded by naturalists as being the surest proof of the distinction of species.

4. **Psychological Argument.**—Oneness of species of the various races of men is also shown by sameness of psychological nature. Each species has its own peculiar psychic nature. This nature differs in the different species. That of the wolf is one, of the fox another, and so they differ in the lion, horse, cow, dog, and cat. It is this psychic nature or immaterial principle, as Agassiz called it, that is the most important distinction of species. It is not the difference in physical structure that makes the lion ferocious and the lamb docile, but the difference is in their inner natures. A certain variety of dogs might have much the same outward appearance of a lion, but such superficial similarity would make him none the less a dog, because he has the inner dog nature. And each species recognizes that inner nature in those of its kind. The instincts of the wolf have been the same always and everywhere. Likewise every species has instincts and habits peculiar to its kind because of identity of psychic nature.

The various races of men have this same identity of soul as to kind. All of them have the same kind of instincts, inner feelings, reason, power of speech, feeling of moral responsibility, and disposition to worship a higher power. A great contrast may exist, it is true, between the degraded African savage and the highly civilized Caucasian, but such differences are accidental rather than essential. Examples of extreme ignorance and degradation may be cited among Caucasians, and instances of high intellectual attainments, excellent moral character, and unwavering Christian piety in the black and Mongolian races. This is evidence that their essential psychic natures are the same.

5. **Philological Argument.**—Comparative p h i l o l o g y, or the study of languages, is a science based on laws as certain as those on which the physical sciences depend. Ethnologists trust more to the similarities between languages to show the relation of different peoples to one another than to any other one means. The existence of the same words in different languages is evidence that they are derived from a common original. "It is impossible that races, entirely distinct, should have the same

language." Max Muller has said, "The evidence of language is irrefragable, and it is the only evidence worth listening to, with regard to antehistorical periods. . . . There is not an English jury nowadays, which, after examining the hoary documents of language, would reject the claim of a common descent and a legitimate relationship between Hindu, Greek, and Teuton" (Quoted by Hodge, Systematic Theology, Vol. II, p. 90).

Philologists have given abundant testimony to the unity of the race by showing that the various human languages are from a common original, which implies unity of species.

6. **Biblical Argument.**—The clear, foregoing, scientific proofs of the unity of species of the human race are commonly accepted as evidence of unity of origin. Naturalists ordinarily assume unity of origin when they have evidence of oneness of species. Certainly unity of species makes a place for a common original parentage of all men which could not be admitted if it could be shown that the races of men are different species.

But the Scriptures teach that all men sprang from a single pair and therefore imply unity of species. The Mosaic narrative of creation clearly represents Adam as the first man. In referring to him Paul said, "the first man Adam" (1 Cor. 15:45). No pre-Adamite race existed, for it is said of Adam until Eve was created "there was not found an helpmeet for him." Eve was so named by Adam "because she was the mother of all living," which could not have been true if a previously created race existed. The Genesis account represents all mankind as having been descended from Adam, and Noah and his family, who were his descendants, as the only human beings saved from the deluge.

In his address on Mars's Hill to the Athenians Paul said, "And [God] hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth" (Acts 17:26). If it be objected that the best authority on the Greek text disallows ἅίματος (*haimatos*) translated "blood" in the Common Version and that the Revised Version is more correct, the statement is strengthened rather than weakened. With the idea of their being of one blood it might be reasoned that they are merely of one nature or species, but the Revised rendering definitely declares that all nations of men are descended from "one," implying one person, father, parentage, or source. No statement

could more clearly affirm the fact of singleness of origin of the race. This is in harmony with the various verses in Rom. 5: 12-19 which teach that sin and death is the portion of all men because of Adam's sin.

II. Constituent Elements in Man's Nature

The Bible does not attempt to give a system of anthropology or of psychology. What it says bearing on the essential elements of man's nature is only incidental to its high religious purpose. Elaborate systems of Biblical psychology have been worked out, but we are no more justified in looking to the Bible for a knowledge of the science of psychology than for our knowledge of geology, astronomy, or any other natural science. The purpose of the Bible is to teach religion, not science. Its references to nature are always subordinate and incidental to its primary purpose. Yet, as God's inspired Word, it may be expected that it will not be found contradictory to what we know of the constitution of nature. Even though it does not tell us some things about man, yet what it does say is true.

1. **Dual Constitution of Man.**—That man is a compound being is taught by the Bible, by philosophy, and by common sense. Materialism denies the reality of a distinct spiritual entity in him, and idealism denies the reality of his material body, but the Bible and the common thought of mankind clearly recognize both.

Men intuitively know substance as a reality. The actual existence of their material bodies is an inalienable conviction of men everywhere. They know the reality of the matter composing their bodies by its properties—extension, weight, tangibility, and divisibility. But they also know another class of phenomena—thought, feeling, volition—which can not be referred to material substance as its cause. These effects must be referred to a cause which is a spirit. As we know matter by its properties, so we know mind or spirit by its phenomena. And because phenomena must have a ground in real existence, therefore we know the substance called spirit is a distinct entity. But as we do not know exhaustively what is spirit, so we do not know what is matter. We only know the phenomena of the first and the properties of the second. But we know they are distinct and different in their natures. The mind is not spiritualized matter, neither is the body materialized mind.

Man then is composed of a material body and spirit, each a distinct entity, yet united in one nature or being. What is the connection of the spirit and the body is inscrutable. How the one acts on the other is a mystery. Yet we know they interact and are interdependent one on the other. The body is dependent on the spirit for its life. Without the spirit it at once becomes subject to the disorganizing forces of chemical laws and decays. Also the mind is dependent, at least in our present state, on the bodily senses for its connection with the external world. The mind operates the body, and yet disorders of the body may result in a disordered state of mind. Emotions of the mind, joy or fear, cause the heart to beat faster, yet a blow on the head may result in unconsciousness. This intimate relation of spirit and body is inexplicable, but it is true, and yet not inconsistent with the idea of the spirit and body being distinct entities. This idea of two entities in one nature is known as realistic dualism.

The Scripture agrees with reason in recognizing this twofoldness in man's nature. This distinction is recognized in the account of man's original creation. He is formed from the dust of the ground, but he became a living soul only when God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. Biblical proof of man's duality is found in those texts which indicate a distinction between spirit and body. "The Lord . . . formeth the spirit of man within him" (Zech. 12:1). "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?" (1 Cor. 2:11). The idea of relation here expressed excludes the idea of identity. The spirit is not the body, but *in* it. It is the knowing, volitional part of man. "Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" (Micah 6:7). Here the soul is represented as so different from the body that the sin of the soul can not be adequately atoned for by a sacrifice of the fruit of the body. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it" (Eccl. 12:7). "I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body" (Dan. 7:15). "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. 10:28). Such a definite duality in man's constitution is constantly recognized in the Bible.

Two distinct entities, spirit and body, are also the clear implication of those texts which represent the body as being the house in which the spirit dwells. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. . . . Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. . . . We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord" (2 Cor. 5:1, 6, 8). Again he said, "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you" (Phil. 1:23, 24). The apostle Peter uses similar language. "Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me" (2 Peter 1:13, 14). In 2 Cor. 12:2 the apostle Paul makes the assertion that one had an experience during which he did not know whether he was "in the body" or "out of the body."

Nothing can be more certain than that this last class of texts represents the soul, the real person, as being so truly distinct from the body that it may have conscious existence apart from the body. Surely conscious existence is better than unconsciousness, yet Paul says it is "better" to depart from the body to be with Christ. After death the spirit of the righteous lives with Christ. Jesus said to the converted thief, "Today shalt thou be with me in paradise." This could not have been true except of the spirit of either of them. But further citation of Scripture proof of man's twofoldness is needless because it is accepted almost universally by believers in the Bible.

2. **The Theory of Trichotomy.**—In contradistinction to this twofold, or dichotomous view of man's nature is the theory that he is trichotomous, or that there are three distinct elements in his nature—body soul, and spirit. Trichotomy has been advocated by Christians to a greater or less degree both in the past and present. It is not essentially contradictory to any Christian doctrine, and it is doubtful whether the Bible affords any positive disproof of the theory. But the chief objection to it is that the large majority of careful interpreters find no Biblical sup-

port for it, though its friends depend almost exclusively upon certain statements of Scriptures for its proof. Psychology not only fails to find such a distinction of factors in man as trichotomists make between soul and spirit, but any attempt at such a distinction is found to be confusing to thought. Reason clearly recognizes a difference between the material and spiritual natures, but finds no ground for further distinction as to different factors in man's nature.

The theory has been held in a variety of forms. It assumes three elements in man's constitution—σῶμα (*soma,* body), ψυχή (*psuche,* soul), and πνεῦμα (*pneuma,* spirit). The simplest and most common form of the theory is that the body is the material part, the soul the principle of animal life, and the spirit the rational or immortal part of our natures. With this view that which has to do with sense perceptions, understanding, and feeling belongs to the soul, and reason, will, and immortality to the spirit. It holds that at death the soul and body cease to be and only the spirit survives. Soul is attributed to the brute creation, but not spirit. In the possession of the higher principle, the spirit, man is differentiated from the lower animals. This form of the theory of trichotomy has the advantage of definiteness and intelligibility, even though it does lack support both rational and Biblical.

Trichotomy was held by the Platonic philosophy and, as a result of the strong influence of Platonism on early Christian thought, found a considerable degree of acceptance in the early church, especially in the school of Alexandria. It was strongly opposed by Tertullian and was given no support by Augustine, which resulted in its coming to be viewed with disfavor by the majority of Christians even until the present time. The principal reason for the opposition to trichotomy was the use made of it to support certain heresies.

The Gnostics, who held that the spirit was not capable of sin because a part of the divine essence, made the theory of trichotomy contribute to that heresy. The Apollinarians held an erroneous Christology which required trichotomy for its support. It affirmed that Christ had a human body and soul joined with the divine logos instead of the spirit or the rational part of human nature. Semi-Pelagianism also built on trichotomy its theory that native depravity affected not the spirit, but only

the soul. In opposing these errors the more orthodox found it convenient to refute them by disproving trichotomy. But the mere fact that it has been employed in support of heretical doctrines is not proof that it is itself error. Orthodox Christians have not infrequently held it, supposing it was a necessary implication of Scripture.

The texts appealed to in support of trichotomy may be very naturally understood in a dichotomous sense and some of them can be shown not to teach trichotomy. Probably the most common trichotomic text is 1 Thess. 5:23, "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." This verse is intended to express the idea of sanctification and preservation of the whole being. The terms "spirit," "soul," and "body" are employed to express this idea of entireness. A further example of such a method of representing the whole being is found in Luke 10:27: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind." Here four terms are employed to express entireness. But if they were regarded as enumerating the different elements of man's constitution, as trichotomists suppose is done in Paul's statement, then Jesus here goes a step further and teaches tetrachotomy. Another text relied upon to support trichotomy is Heb. 4:12: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." It is assumed that here joints and marrow imply the body and therefore with the words "soul" and "spirit" added trichotomy is taught. But if such a method is to be followed, consistency requires that we include "heart" at the end of the verse. Thus again we would have four-foldness, or tetrachotomy instead of trichotomy. The intent of the verse is not to enumerate the elements of the human constitution, but to show the penetrating power of God's Word. If soul and spirit are significant of different elements, why not also joints and marrow? But as it is certain that joints and marrow are merely different forms of the same substance, so it is reasonable to think of soul and spirit as different aspects or relations of one and the same substance. Other texts assumed

to support trichotomy furnish no better proof of the theory than do the foregoing ones.

In the common English usage soul and spirit are without distinction of meaning, and after naming the corresponding words in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, Dr. Hodge says, "These words all designate one and the same thing. They are constantly interchanged" (Systematic Theology, Vol. II, p. 48). That they are used interchangeably may be known by a comparison of texts where they occur. Contrary to the theory under consideration, πνεῦμα (*pneuma*), as well as ψυχή (*psuche*), is used of the brute creation (Eccl. 3:21, LXX). Also ψυχή (*psuche*) is ascribed to God, who certainly does not have the nature of the animal. The disembodied spirits of the dead are called ψυχή (*psuche*), or souls (Rev. 6:29). It is the soul that sins (Lev. 4:2), and God commands to love the Lord "with all thy soul" (Luke 10:27). It is the highest part in man and to it are referred the highest exercises of religion. It is the soul that is lost through sin. "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" (Mark 8:36). The soul then is not the mere animal life of the body, but that which may be lost after the body is dead.

The element of truth in trichotomy is its recognition of different aspects of man's inner being. Although the terms "soul" and "spirit" do not represent distinct substances of human nature, they have value as do also "heart" and "mind" in representing the higher spiritual nature in its different relations and powers or faculties. To repudiate the distinction of soul and spirit as factors is not to deny the distinction in faculties of man's psychic nature. In conclusion, then, we say there is no proof in the Bible or science that man is threefold. Dichotomy is both reasonable and Scriptural, but that man is more than twofold can not be proved and is not required by any truth of Christianity.

3. **How Man Is Superior to the Brute.**—With the repudiation of the theory that man possesses a distinct element in his nature that differentiates him from the brute, the question may well be asked, what is the distinctive mark of man? It is evident he is immeasurably superior to the brute. All must admit this. This superiority is such that he can not have been evolved from the brute. Doubtless because of our ignorance due to inability

to communicate with brutes it is impossible to draw an exact line between them, other than that man is immeasurably superior to the brutes because created in God's image. We can safely affirm the general distinction that the powers of man's spirit are far above those of the brute. The popular theory that man has reason and the animals have instinct is not a satisfactory distinction, for animals have a certain measure of reason and man is not entirely without instinct. By instinct the new-born infant draws milk from the mother's breast.

A degree of intelligence exists in animals as well as in man, but man's mind has capacities immeasurably higher than has that of the brute. Animals have certain general conceptions, memory, and some capacity for reasoning, though very little, if any, power of abstract thought. But man is capable of developing reasoning powers whose capacities for abstract thought are almost without limitation. His higher intellectual qualities are shown by his higher activities. Animals evidently have a limited ability to communicate with each other, but man employs elaborate languages—systems of arbitrary signs vocal and in writing by which he may exactly transmit his thought to another. Man alone makes fires, clothes himself, makes tools and machinery to accomplish his purposes, writes, draws pictures, writes histories, and improves his race.

Feeling also exists in brutes as in man. The horse or dog may show great love and loyalty to its master. They have a certain measure of free-will, but the range of man's freedom is far greater than that of brutes. Their freedom is within the limits of their natures, but man can choose contrary to his nature. He also has power to choose his supreme end and determine his character accordingly.

We have no evidence that brutes feel obligation to a power above their own race. But man has conscience which enables him to recognize acts as right or wrong, impels him to the right, and reproves him if he does wrong. Especially is he above the beasts in possessing a religious nature. He prays always and in all nations. This high capacity of man's spirit is peculiar to him. In his capacity for indefinite intellectual development, in his exalted freedom of will, in his moral nature and capacity for religion, he is truly created in the image of God.

III. The Origin of Souls

The obscure question of the origin of the individual soul of each human being is not necessarily of practical consequence to theology. Yet all thoughtful minds are sooner or later confronted with it and in seeking its answer they have sometimes evolved theories that are contradictory to the Scriptures. If certain knowledge on this subject is impossible it is at least important that we avoid antiscriptural theories. Three theories have been held respecting the origin of souls. They are: first, preexistence; second, creationism—that the soul of each person is immediately created of God; and third, traducianism—that souls are brought into being by the parents according to the natural laws of propagation.

1. **Theory of Preexistence.**—This theory assumes that men's souls have an existence prior to their connection with physical bodies in this world. The theory was given prominence in the early church by its having been advocated by Origen, who borrowed it from Plato. It has been held in recent times by Kant, Julius Mueller, and Edward Beecher, but neither in ancient nor modern times has it ever been accepted by any large number of Christian believers. The theory supposes the souls of all men were created at the same time as that of Adam.

Origen connects this theory of preexistence with the idea of transmigration of souls. He assumes all souls have passed through many former existences, or epochs, and are to pass through many more. In a previous existence souls have sinned and it is these sinful souls that are condemned to inhabit physical bodies in this world. He attempts to account for varying degrees of natural sinfulness at birth on the supposition that some committed more or greater sins in a previous existence than did others. His main object in assuming preexistence was to account for varying degrees of native depravity. In objection it may be said all that needs to be accounted for in this respect may be better explained in other ways that are not at variance with the Bible. Especially, as has been remarked by Dr. H. C. Sheldon, "if souls had such a decisive moral development in a previous state as the theory implies, it is reasonable to assume that they had also an appreciable intellectual development. Why then is no sign of that development to be found in the embodied subject? Why is the infant so utterly destitute of every

trace of intellectual maturity, and obliged to gain every item of knowledge by the hard road of tuition and trial?''

Further reason for repudiating the theory of preexistence of souls is the entire lack of Scriptural support. It is an unscriptural assumption. A still stronger objection is the Pauline teaching that the sinfulness of the race is a consequence of the sin of Adam (Rom. 5:12). Degrees of natural or inborn depravity are entirely consistent with the idea of inheritance of moral tendencies. The preexistence theory affirms pure individualism —race sinfulness is excluded. Still further it may be objected to preexistence that if in a previous epoch souls committed sin for which they are now punished they must have been conscious and, if so, as A. H. Strong has reasoned, ''it is inexplicable that we should have no remembrance of such preexistence.''

2. **Theory of Creationism.**—That human souls are the products of immediate divine creation was the view of Jerome and Pelagius and has since been held by the Roman Catholic and Reformed theologians. This theory affirms that God creates out of nothing each individual soul when its body is formed, either at conception or at birth. Its advocates claim for it both Scriptural and rational support.

They cite certain statements of Scripture that affirm God is the creator and father of the human spirit. ''The spirit shall return unto God who gave it'' (Eccl. 12:7). God is said to form ''the spirit of man within him'' (Zech. 12:1). These and other texts similarly attributing man's soul to God may support creationism, but they do not necessarily do so, for it is conceivable that he gives the spirit mediately through natural processes as he is said to give us our daily bread. Also he may be said to ''form'' the spirit according to natural laws as it is said he forms the body of the infant in the womb of the mother. A stronger text for creationism is Heb. 12:9, where God is called ''the Father of our spirits'' in antithesis to ''fathers of our flesh.'' But this is not conclusive proof, because ''fathers'' is used with such latitude in the Bible that it may mean merely that he was the original author of the human spirit much as Abraham was the father of the Israelitish people. The antithesis may be regarded as between the general relation of man's spirit to the Divine Spirit and the relation of us to our parents.

It is also urged that distinct individuality of children, especi-

ally in extreme cases like Abraham Lincoln, whose family was obscure, can be accounted for only on the theory of creationism. Traducianists, however, believe such examples of marked personality may be fully accounted for on the ground of a law of variation. Other objections are made to creationism. If creationism be true, then human parents beget only the lower part of their child; and the higher element, the real person, is not from them. Then the human race is only a race with respect to the physical and in the highest sense they are only an order of beings. The beast, then, has higher powers of propagation than man, for he begets in his own image. Also if creationism is true it is difficult to show that God is not the creator of sinful or depraved souls. It may be reasoned that God creates the soul pure at the time of conception and it becomes depraved during the embryonic period as a result of its close connection with the mother. Such a view would be objectionable to many, however, in that it represents depravity as being transmitted only by the mother. A still further objection sometimes urged is that it makes God a party to the begetting of illegitimate children.

3. **Theory of Traducianism.**—This theory was held by Tertullian and Augustine, and is the belief of Lutherans, as well as of many eminent theologians of other bodies. It holds that souls are propagated rather than created, or that as the body is transmitted by the parents so is the soul, though not necessarily in the same manner. Adam's soul was an immediate divine creation, but since then the divine working is only mediate in the origination of souls.

The Scriptures are appealed to in support of the theory. At the close of the six days of creation God is said to have rested from his creative work; therefore, it is reasoned, he does not now create souls. God has "made of one [blood omitted, R. V.] all nations of men" (Acts 17:26). Aaron was "in the loins of his father [Abraham], when Melchisedec met him" (Heb. 7:10). These texts evidently refer to more than the bodies of men. Also it is reasoned from the analogy of lower nature that as vegetables and especially animals with minds propagate their kind and in no part are the product of immediate creation, so it is proper so to think of man. An objection often made against traducianism is that it lends support to the materialistic

view of the soul. But in reply it may be asked that if the soul or immaterial part of brutes can be propagated why can not that of men and in the same manner? An argument in support of such transmission is the fact that not only physical but mental and moral characteristics are known by observation to be transmitted from parent to offspring constantly. Transmission of moral depravity is very noticeable. Traducianism is especially harmonious with the Biblical doctrine of native depravity, and in this particular has distinct advantages over creationism.

Doubtless most Christians who have any opinion on the subject, hold either creationism or traducianism. But among the most careful thinkers even of the same schools of theological thought some hold one view and some the other. The view held of the mode of the transmission of depravity has a great influence in determining the theory of the origin of souls that is accepted. Those holding the realistic theory find traducianism most harmonious with it. Those who hold representativism or the federal headship theory of depravity incline to creationism. Others are divided. To our thought the traducian view seems to have most in its favor. But that we do not pretend to be wise above that which is written we refrain from dogmatism. Those who hold creationism will not be harmed by it even if it is erroneous, if it can be held without affirming that God sanctions every act of procreation and that he creates sinful souls, and if it is held without a denial of native depravity. Likewise it is important to those holding traducianism that they guard against any materialistic view of the soul, the realistic theory of depravity, and the depravity and guilt of the human nature of Christ. Such a guarded theory of traducianism would probably not be harmful even though it were untrue.

IV. The Question of Immortality

1. **Man's Body Created Mortal.**— The popular notion that man's body was originally inherently immortal is not supported by Scripture nor reason. As created he was naturally mortal. His physical constitution was like that of the animals, which in no case are said to be immortal. Like them, his body was made of the dust, and was therefore subject to change and dissolution, by which it would return to dust again.

That man's body was created essentially mortal is evident

from the Scriptures. In its present condition it is commonly represented as "your mortal body" (Rom. 6:12; 8:11). That it was originally mortal is certain, because it was made of temporal matter, dust (Gen. 2:7). It was given natural food to sustain it, which would have been superfluous if it was immortal (Gen. 1:29). Adam was given work to do to provide that food for himself (Gen. 2:15). Marriage was instituted and propagation of the race was enjoined (Gen. 1:28), which is not true of the angels, who are immortal (Luke 20:35, 36). Also the tree of life was provided; by eating the fruit of which his life was continued and death counteracted (Gen. 3:22).

"But the crowning proof that man was originally mortal is the fact that he was 'made' 'a little lower than the angels' (Psa. 8:4, 5 with Heb. 2:6, 7). In what sense was man lower than the angels? Not morally or spiritually, for in these respects man was in God's image, and surely the angels are not higher than God is. What, then, does the expression mean? In Heb. 1:7 we read that God 'maketh his angels spirits,' that they are 'all ministering spirits' (v. 14). Jesus plainly states that 'a spirit hath not flesh and bones' (Luke 24:39). Therefore we conclude that man's inferiority to angels consists in his limitations due to a physical body, while the angels are wholly spirit beings .... Now, according to the scripture cited in Psa 8:4-8, man was 'made' in this inferior condition at the time when he was given universal dominion over God's works, which shows clearly that his original condition physically was the same as now —not inherently immortal—and that no specific change took place in his bodily organism as a result of the fall" (F. G. Smith, What the Bible Teaches, pp. 54, 55). After quoting from the Psalms in Heb. 2:7 that man was *made* lower than the angels, the inspired writer also states in the ninth verse that Jesus was also "made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death." This clearly shows that man was created lower than the angels in the sense that they are wholly immortal while in his original constitution he was subject to death.

Before the fall death was possible, but by the fall it became actual. Originally pain, injury, and disease were possible and if not prevented might lead to death, but God provided the fruit of the tree of life to counteract it. It was only when sin led to

expulsion from Eden and exclusion from the tree of life that death ceased to be a contingency and became a reality.

2. **The Soul Is Immortal.**—Endless existence is the unconditional destiny of the soul. Its immortality is not determined by its character whether it be good or evil. It is created in the image of the eternal God and resembles him in its immortal quality. The fact of its immortality is evidence of its exalted dignity and therefore is of great significance in properly estimating the value of its interests in this life and in its future life. Except the soul lives forever, life is vain and without purpose. But as Longfellow has said:

> "Life is real, life is earnest
> And the grave is not its goal;
> Dust thou art, to dust returnest,
> Was not spoken of the soul."

The Bible declares the soul is immortal. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (2 Cor. 5:11). "We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord" (chap. 5:8). These verses teach that the soul continues to exist after the body dies, and inasmuch as conscious existence is better than unconsciousness they teach the future condition of the soul will be conscious existence. This is implied also in Phil. 1:23, where the Apostle says that to depart from the body and be with Christ is far better. In Matt. 10:28 it is said, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." Immortality of the soul is also implied by many other texts, especially those which represent future blessedness or punishment as "everlasting." Besides the proofs from Scripture, the immortality of the soul may well be reasoned from the soul's capacity for unlimited development, and also from an inalienable desire for unending existence.

CHAPTER II

ORIGINAL MORAL NATURE AND STATE OF MAN

I. Primitive Man of a Lofty Grade

The Bible is the sole source of authority concerning the original grade and powers of man. Concerning these, two extremes have been advocated. On the one hand he has been regarded as possessing absolute perfection, and on the other hand it has been held, by theistic evolutionists especially, that even after he became man he was of so low a grade that many millenniums were required for his development to his present stage. The Scripture evidently represents primitive man as having been created in a state of maturity and perfection, not in one of infancy.

1. **Constituted Relatively Perfect.**—When man, the final product of God's creative effort, had been made, "God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good" (Gen. 1: 31). The sense in which all things are here said to have been good is that they were adapted to the purpose for which they were created. They were good in the sense that an automobile that will carry a reasonable load at a fair speed is said to be good. A watch is said to be good if it correctly measures time. Its case may not be made of the finest gold, nor beautifully engraved, but if it keeps time it is a good watch because it is made to keep time. Man was good in the sense that he was so constituted physically, mentally, and morally as properly to fulfil the design of his creation.

The sense in which man's physical being was originally "good" is doubtless not to be understood as that of absolute perfection. It is enough to suppose it was good for the use that was to be made of it. It was adapted to the capacities of the soul within in its ability to execute what the mind might conceive. It was good also in that it was free from disease and in good health. It possessed strength sufficient for all duties devolving upon it. It was equal to any reasonable demand that would be made upon it. We have no reason for believing it was the body of a giant, that it never became weary, that it possessed angelic beauty, that it was not susceptible to hunger, pain, or wounds. As previously stated, it was subject to death and decay,

although a preventive of death was provided in the tree of life.

Intellectually, primitive man must have been of a high grade. Inbecility or an infantile mind is incompatible with his moral responsibility and probation. It is doubtful whether a mature body with only the mind of an infant could have survived. The naming of the animals by Adam before the woman was made implies a large degree of mentality, especially when it is remembered that the names of things were formerly given to describe their characteristics. It has been reasoned that in order thus to name every member of the animal kingdom Adam must have had immediate perception of their qualities. But we need to beware lest we carry this line of reasoning further than the facts warrant. It is doubtful whether Adam named all the hundreds of thousands of different species of animals. Gen. 2:19 states that God "formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam." The text may well be understood to teach, not that all were brought, but only that some of them were brought. The original word translated "all" in verse 20 is often not to be understood as all in the absolute sense. Considering that the number of species of animals numbers two or three millions (according to Darwin), if he had named one each minute for several hours daily he would have been engaged for a few years in naming them. Probably he named only the more common animals which inhabited the garden of Eden. If so, the naming of the animals is no proof of superhuman intelligence.

It is evident from what is revealed in the Scriptures that his intelligence was of a high order, but we have no proof that Adam's perceptive faculties were such that he perfectly perceived all that came before him, that his memory was absolutely retentive, that his judgments were always correct, or that in his reasoning he always passed accurately from premise to conclusion. In other words, he was not infinite in his intellectual powers. Absolute perfection does not belong to the finite. We may not unreasonably believe that primitive man was at least equal intellectually to the most brilliant and balanced minds living today. Certainly he was originally so constituted intellectually that he was morally responsible.

As to his moral nature, the statement that man was originally good must mean that he was not naturally inclined to evil, that

his conscience distinguished the right, impelled to it, and would have reproved for wrong-doing. His disposition was to love God supremely and in relation to others to hold an unselfish attitude. His will was efficient to choose that which he should do.

2. **Not a Barbarian.**—Much has been said by those who assume man is a product of evolution of successive stone, bronze, and iron ages. These are a necessary assumption to the theory of evolution, but as often held are without ground in facts. Doubtless particular tribes or nations have passed through such stages corresponding to their progress from savagery to civilization, but there is no proof that a stone age prevailed among all nations at the same time. Many centuries ago the inhabitants of certain parts of Europe seem to have used implements and weapons of stone only. But in the time of men still living certain tribes of American Indians were yet in their stone age. Savages in some parts of the world still use flint instruments. The facts of history indicate that the stone, bronze, and iron ages have all subsisted contemporaneously. It is as illogical for men today to reason that because certain tribes of primitive men were barbarians all were so, as it would be for one in the distant future to reason that because certain African tribes of the present were illiterate and barbarous therefore no civilization existed in other parts of the world at this time. It is conceivable that primitive man enjoyed a simple civilization and that certain tribes degenerated and were later recovered.

The Bible clearly represents Adam as being far above a state of barbarism. He was created in a high state of intelligence and morals. Christians need no further proof than this. The statements of Scripture are also corroborated by traditions of all nations of a past golden age. Also the most ancient monuments and written records of man known today indicate a high civilization. The pyramids of Egypt antedate history, yet who can believe such colossal works requiring so much ingenuity, so much well-organized labor, and such vast wealth could be the work of barbarians? Equally early were the ancient Accadians, who, as has been learned in recent years from the Chaldean and Assyrian inscriptions, were a highly civilized people. History shows the most ancient peoples were civilized. This well agrees with the teaching of Scripture that man was originally civilized, but has lost that civilization in a measure.

Another argument against primal barbarism is the lack of evidence that any savage people have ever lifted up themselves without civilizing influences being exerted from without. History shows that Egypt obtained its civilization from the East, where according to the Bible the race had its origin. Greece derived its civilization from Egypt and Phoenicia, Rome from Greece and Phoenicia, other parts of Europe from Italy, America from Europe, and now the Far East, and especially the South Sea Islands, and Africa are becoming civilized through Europe and America.

Progress in the arts, science, and invention is not to be confused with that simple civilization that was the condition of primitive man. Certainly great advancement has been made in these things in modern times. Primitive man was civilized in that he was in a high state intellectually, morally, and religiously. Socrates, Plato, or Aristotle never saw an aeroplane, and were ignorant of the wonders of electricity, but how few of those who are acquainted with such things nearly approach to the great intelligence and reasoning ability of these men? Doubtless most of the world's greatest philosophers, moralists, and religious leaders were ignorant of modern inventions. It is in the sense in which these men were in an advanced state that we may properly affirm primitive man was not a barbarian.

But the question may be asked, "How did man deteriorate into barbarism?" That such deterioration is possible is shown by the experience of certain colonies of enlightened people who have settled in isolated and frontier regions where without religious and educational influences they have, in the course of two or three generations, sunk to a condition little better than savagery. Evidently in the course of many generations under the debasing influence of a sinful nature and evil practises barbarism may well have been the result. The Bible assigns as the cause of the degradation of men, their substitution of idolatry for the knowledge and worship of the true God. History shows that true civilization results from the exaltation of pure religion. Likewise degradation has usually followed the rejection of the worship of the true God.

3. **In the Divine Image.**—No truth relative to man's original moral nature is more important than that announced when his creation was determined upon. "And God said, Let us make

man in our image, after our likeness . . . . So God created man in his own image'' (Gen. 1:26, 27). An attempt has been made to distinguish between the image and the likeness of God. Augustine understood image to relate to the intellectual nature, and likeness to the moral nature. In the doctrine of the scholastics the image of God includes the natural attributes of man and the likeness the moral similarity to God. Still others have supposed the image of God was what man was by creation and that likeness referred to his acquired characteristics, or moral qualities resulting from his conduct. But there is no good ground in the reading of the text either in the English translation or in the original for any such distinction. The most natural and evidently the true meaning of ''image'' and ''likeness'' is an image that is like God.

Man is in the divine image, not merely in a particular aspect, but in a complex of characteristics of his nature. Certainly he is not in the divine image as to his physical being, for God is a purely spiritual being without corporeity. Therefore we must look to man's soul for the divine image. God is a spirit, and man's soul is a spirit. In this broad sense man is in God's image. But in various particulars the human spirit has qualities similar to the divine Spirit. Spirit implies in both God and man personality with the characteristics that constitute one a person —intellect, sensibility, and will. It is of these high qualities that the essential image of God consists.

But for religion and in the Bible the important aspect of the divine image is the moral nature of man which is possible through his spiritual and personal nature. This moral image is represented in the Bible as having been lost through sin. This loss was not by deprivation of any essential faculty or portion of human nature, but by derangement or weakening of the faculties in respect to moral conduct. In the work of regeneration the divine image is described as recreated or restored. ''Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness'' (Eph. 4:24). ''And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him'' (Col. 3:10).

II. Conscience

The reality of conscience is generally admitted, and though

the term "conscience" is very much used, yet few words are so differently understood or so much misunderstood as is this. It is used by some in a broad sense to include functions of both the intellect and sensibilities, while others use it in the restricted sense as pertaining only to the sensibilities. Conscience is not a separate faculty of the soul, as are intellect, sensibility, or will. It is rather a particular mode in which these separate faculties act. The operation of conscience includes both the intellectual element and the emotional element. It is these acting in the realm of morals.

Men are naturally endowed with the ability to recognize a moral quality of actions, to judge as to the rightness or wrongness of a particular action, and they are conscious of a feeling of obligation to do what is conceived to be right and of restraint from the wrong. In relation to a particular course of action conscience (1) determines whether the course is right or wrong in relation to its accepted standard of right, (2) feels a sense of ought or ought not according as the course is right or wrong, and (3) feels approval or remorse according as the course judged to be right is followed or not. Conscience then may be said to have three distinct functions—(1) discriminating, (2) impulsive, (3) retributive. H. C. Sheldon has said, "Conscience is inclusive of three distinct elements: a perception of moral distinctions, a sense of obligation to the right, as opposed to the wrong, and a feeling of self-approbation, or self-condemnation according as the act corresponds to the judgment of right and wrong."

1. **The Discriminating Function.**—This is the intellectual phase of conscience. It is the exercise of the judgment in matters of moral conduct. In this aspect conscience is not to be thought of as a sort of moral instinct which serves as an inerrant guide concerning abstract right and wrong. It does not act irrespective of rational thought. As men are not born infallible mathematicians, so they are not born infallible moralists. But as they are born with a capacity for recognizing the relation of numbers, so they are born with a moral constitution intrinsically suited to recognize moral distinctions. It is natural for a mother to love her child. If, however, along with her own new-born child another is presented to her, her natural parental affection will not enable her to know which is her own, but when she knows which belongs to her at once her mother-love discriminates

between it and the other child. Likewise it is not the conscience that determines what is right and wrong abstractly, but when the standard of abstract right is furnished it, it has the ability to determine whether a particular act conforms to that standard.

The discriminating function of conscience should not be confounded with the moral intuition, or with that sense of justice and right that is in every person and is essential to the moral nature. Neither should we confound it with accepted law or the individual's standard of right. Every person possesses an individual standard which he accepts as right. This standard is not determined by his own choice, but is what he sincerely believes is right. It is usually the result of intuitive ideas, the influences of education and society, reasoning, and divine revelation. Though this standard is not conscience, yet it is the ground upon which conscience determines the rightness or wrongness of an act. Only to the extent that this personal standard agrees with absolute abstract right will the conscience prove a dependable guide to that which is right in its own nature. But that personal standard is not always conformed to that which is truly right. It is determined to a very great extent by influences from without, especially the teaching to which one listens. If one believes the ceremonial law of Moses is binding upon Christians and that he should therefore observe the seventh day, Saturday, as a day of rest from all physical labor, when he is confronted with the question of whether or not he should perform a certain act involving labor on that day his conscience will promptly discriminate against its performance, even though it is not wrong in itself.

2. **Impulsive Power.**—A second function of conscience is the feeling of duty or sense of obligation to do what is conceived to be right and to refrain from what is believed to be wrong. In this aspect the reality of conscience is clearer than in its discriminating capacity, because this feeling of obligation is more distinctly cognizable and therefore more impressive. As the discriminating function of conscience was shown to be the intellectual faculty operating in the field of morals, so the impulsive function is the emotional faculty acting in the same field and not itself a separate faculty. In this respect conscience is a feeling of obligation to the right and restraint from the wrong which has its basis in the moral nature. It is not merely a feeling of

desire for the pleasurable and of aversion for the painful as has sometimes been affirmed. Certain evidence of this is that often men freely choose the path of hardship, suffering, and even death because they feel it is the path of duty.

But what is this sense of obligation? The question is more easily asked than answered and yet every one knows what it is. It is not capable of logical definition, and can be truly known only by experience. The feeling of obligation impels one to duty, but does not compel. It in no wise interferes with freedom. It may be antagonized or favored by other impulses, affections, appetites, and passions. It is because of this that conscience is weakened through depravity. If inquiry be made as to whence came this feeling of obligation or how we came to possess the sense of "ought," it must be said we have not acquired it by education, but that it is native or inborn. The feeling of obligation arises as soon as one comes to the age of moral responsibility. It is a part of the human constitution, as is reason or memory. Here is positive proof that man has a moral nature. The reason men feel they "ought" is because they are so constituted that they "ought." They have the sense of obligation because of the fact that they are under obligation.

The sense of duty has its ground in two facts. The first cause of obligation is found in man's nature, the second in his relationship to God. It belongs to personality to feel a sense of obligation. All the elements of personality are indicative of obligation. Personality includes reason, sensibility, and will. Reason implies ability to judge between the normal and abnormal and that ability implies obligation to judge as correctly as possible. Sensibility, or the ability to feel, implies the capacity to feel according to that which is judged to be normal, and feeling gives impulse to action. Free-will to choose between a worthy and an unworthy course of action is ground for the feeling of obligation to choose the former. Therefore the sense of ought is a necessary consequence of personality. A second and still more important ground of obligation is the perfect moral nature of God. Because we are made in his image as personal beings, that very perfectness in God can demand nothing less in us than conformity to the same standard of righteousness.

In the impulsive aspect of conscience it holds a position of authority. As soon as the intellectual function of conscience

has determined what is right according to one's accepted standard, then at once conscience begins to function in impelling to the right. It takes the place of authority, from which it will not be moved and stedfastly demands that the right be followed. Possibly one has, through wrong influence, been led to accept a false standard of right, and consequently in a particular matter the discriminating function of conscience has judged that to be wrong which is not so in its nature, as in the question of refraining from labor on Saturday, to which reference has been made. Still conscience will as stedfastly require compliance with that decision as if it were wrong in its nature or God now forbade us to labor on Saturday. Conscience is not an infallible guide to that which is intrinsically right, yet one is always obligated to obey his conscience and failure to do so would be sinful. To fail to comply with conscience would be to violate the sense of duty, and to hold a rebellious attitude of heart toward God, neither of which could possibly be right. Such a violation of conscience must result in disapproval by oneself as well as by God because of the attitude toward him.

3. **Retributive Aspect.**—After conscience has discriminated as to the rightness or wrongness of an act, has impelled to the right and restrained from the wrong and the will has decided for the right or the wrong, even yet there remains a third function of the conscience—the feeling of approval or remorse according as the course chosen was esteemed to be the right or the wrong. This third function of conscience is fully as real as are the others. What can be more real than the lashings of a guilty conscience?

This remorse for sin and approval for righteousness are not to be confounded with fear of punishment and hope of reward. Doubtless these are normally accompaniments of remorse and approval of conscience, yet evidently in some instances the latter are felt by those who do not believe in future retribution. When Judas became fully awakened to the vileness of his deed in betraying his Master for money his remorse was so great that he ended his life, thus at once bringing upon himself retribution for sin in the other world. His act can be accounted for only on the ground of extreme remorse of conscience. This is a common feeling today, not only to those who have committed great crimes,

but even to those with tender consciences who have disregarded the voice of conscience in lesser matters.

Also it was not a mere hope of future blessedness that afforded comfort to the apostle Paul when at the close of his life he remembered that he had fought a good fight and kept the faith. The approval of his conscience afforded him additional pleasure. It not only enabled him to feel God was pleased with him, but thereby he was enabled to respect himself as he could not have done otherwise.

It is reasonable to assume that primitive man was possessed of truer moral intuitions and a fuller divine revelation and, as a consequence, of a better standard of abstract right, so that the decisions of his conscience were more nearly correct than is true with men today. Also we may suppose his conscience was "tender" in that it functioned efficiently in impelling to duty, as is not true of one today whose conscience is "seared." Yet there is no more reason for supposing Adam had infinite knowledge of ethical principles than that he was infinite in other respects. Also it would evidently be contrary to the facts and too much to say that his sense of duty was so strong that he was always impelled to the right.

In all three of its functions conscience becomes more efficient by its being heeded and fails to function to the extent it is neglected. Constant obedience to its dictates causes it to discriminate more truly and the sense of obligation to the right is in proportion to one's constancy in what is believed to be duty.

III. Free Agency

1. **The Question of Freedom Vital to Theology.**—No systematic statement of Christian doctrine can be complete that is silent concerning the will. The question of free will has ever been regarded as of the utmost importance to a correct understanding of the subjects of sin and grace. The view taken of the nature of the will is logically determinative of both theology and religion. The fact of freedom of choice is that which gives character to sin and virtue. If men's wills are determined, sin is not reprehensible and goodness deserves no reward. Under a law of necessity moral character is impossible.

The actual history of doctrine is evidence of the influence of the question of freedom on Christian thought. Consistent with

its theory of freedom, Calvinism has held a monergistic view of salvation. Likewise, Arminianism has consistently affirmed that because the will has power of alternative choice, therefore salvation is synergistic, or is the result of man's choice as well as of God's operation. Because of the recognition of its vital bearing on the fundamental truths of religion there has been in the past much controversy between Calvinists and Arminians concerning freedom. Doubtless there is at present less disposition to controversy concerning this and other doctrinal differences between these opposing schools of thought. This change is probably due in a great measure to a modification of the extreme Calvinistic theories in the popular mind. Yet it would be a mistake to suppose the subsiding of controversy indicates that Calvinism has lost its real character. Though he does not advocate all the extreme views held in Edward's time, yet Charles Hodge, whose Systematic Theology is representative of present-day Calvinism, strongly defends the same objectionable features relative to freedom that have always characterized that system.

2. **Leading Theories of the Will.**—The various theories concerning the will may be grouped into three main classes—necessity, certainty, and alternativity. Necessity, or the denial of freedom, is usually held by all who deny a personal supreme being—atheists, dualists, materialists, and pantheists. These refer all events to either fate or chance. According to the doctrine of fatalism all events are determined by a blind necessity called fate. No intelligent being is back of this necessity, but it is a compelling law of sequence to which all intelligent beings are subject and against which it is useless to struggle. This theory holds that what is to be will be, that no will can modify the ruling of fate and therefore the only proper attitude is submission to it. Chance differs from fate but little. The chance theory assumes that things are as they are because they stood as good a chance to be so as any other way. Whether necessitarians refer the course of events to these, to the forces in matter, or to a "world soul," as does the pantheist, common sense repudiates all their theories and rests securely in the inalienable conviction that man in the image of a personal God is free to choose between various alternatives, and that many things might have been different from what they are if a different choice had been made.

The Calvinistic theory of the will is denominated "Certainty" by Dr. Charles Hodge, one of its ablest modern advocates. Some Calvinistic theologians of the past have regarded it as being necessitarian, but those of the present affirm it is in harmony with the truest and highest freedom. We agree with the most careful thinkers whose minds have not been influenced by the acceptance of Calvinism that in spite of all the efforts by its supporters to prove the contrary it is pure necessitarianism. Only because of respect for the able defenders of it do we consider it deserving of consideration apart from the general classification of theories of necessity. Yet it is fundamentally different from the theories of necessity before named in that they substitute non-intelligent chance or fate for man's free choice while the Calvinistic view makes the will of God the real determining cause instead of the will of man.

The common doctrine of Calvinists at present is that motive determines choice, and that choice is always and must be according to the strongest motive. To state the theory more in detail, it assumes that we do an act because we will to do it, but that we can will to do it only in harmony with our strongest motive, that this motive is determined by character and external influences, and that these are ultimately determined by God so that all events will certainly come to pass as he has predestinated. It is held by its supporters that this theory is compatible with real human freedom, that according to it man chooses freely. But what is the nature of the freedom of this theory? It is freedom only in one direction. It is freedom to do an act, but not freedom to refrain from doing it or to do something else. It is only such freedom as water has to flow in one direction between the banks of a river, or the hands of the clock to move round the dial when unobstructed. It amounts to nothing more than mechanical freedom as far as objective results are concerned. According to it the antecedent is absolutely determinative of the consequence. It admits of no power of choice between alternatives. It holds that only one course is possible and that the will is so determined it must choose that course.

The theory rests on the false assumption that motive, or inducement, is absolutely determinative of choice, and that choice is always according to the strongest motive. Motive may furnish a ground for or influence in choice, but no proof can be adduced

that it determines choice. If it could be shown that motive does absolutely determine one's course, then choice would be without its character of freedom and necessitarianism would certainly follow. As to the second assumption, how shall we know what is the strongest motive? If it be answered, the motive that accords with the choice, then the theory depends for support on reasoning in a circle. The argument must be that we know a particular choice is made because it is determined by the strongest motive, and we know that motive to be strongest because it is according to the choice made. Such argument proves nothing.

The third theory of the will, the theory of alternativity is that which we conceive to describe true freedom. The generic idea of freedom is freedom from restraint. This theory holds not only that man is unrestrained to volitionate in one direction, but that his will is without restraint in every direction. It defines will as an either-causal power, a power of alternativity. It has power of first cause. It really *chooses* one of several possible courses. It is a power both to and from an act. It is a power of "contrary choice," as the more common phrase states it. The will is not restrained, but its volitions are not therefore mere chance as the Calvinist charges. Dr. Whedon has well defined the will as follows: "Will is the power of the soul by which it is the conscious author of an intentional act" (Whedon on the Will, p. 15).

3. **Proofs of Free Will.**—The first reason for believing man has power of alternative choice is the fact that it is a spontaneous impression of all men. They know it intuitively, and like other intuitions it will naturally be accepted unless the mind is constrained to believe its opposite by a false philosophy. But as with other intuitive truths, when the restraint of false reasoning is broken by diverting the mind to other things one at once unconsciously acts on the ineradicable conviction that he has either-causal power. This conviction is so deep-seated that men of every degree of intelligence know they are free.

A second proof of freedom is the facts of conscience. The consciousness of moral obligation implies belief in freedom. One must have power to do or not to do an act if he is responsible for it. If he has power to do a deed of evil, but no power to refrain, he does not deserve penalty for doing it; or if he has

not power to refrain from a good deed, but only to do it, he deserves no reward for it. Such necessitated acts have no moral quality. But man has a settled conviction that he "ought" and "ought not"; therefore he is free to choose. To say a man should be punished for doing what he has no power to refrain from doing is repulsive to his highest sense of justice, and he instinctively feels that any ruler who so deals with his subjects is a cruel tyrant. Freedom is an indispensable condition of moral agency.

If man is determined in his acts he is not an agent, but only an instrument. But it is constantly assumed that he is a free agent. If he commits a murder he is punished. But if his will is determined it is as unreasonable to sentence a man to death or a long term of imprisonment as for the court to decide that the weapon used to commit the crime shall be sentenced to be broken to pieces as a punishment on it for its action in the murder. The common sense of mankind would unite in regarding such procedure with a mere weapon as useless and ridiculous, and it as stedfastly differentiates between instruments and men by attributing to men freedom and personal responsibility for their acts.

A third argument in support of a real freedom of the will is the truth of deliberation. Very often when one is confronted with the necessity of choosing a course of action, a positive decision is intentionally postponed for more mature consideration of the subject before the final choice is precipitated. If the will is free to choose only one of several courses, if it has no power of alternative choice, if the event has been made certain by an efficient eternal decree of God and the will of man is so determined that the choice will be according to that decree; then deliberation is a waste of time, man's deep-seated disposition to think before he acts is a lie stamped on his nature, and it is a mark of wisdom and consistency for one to decide every question at once without useless deliberation, for according to the theory he can not decide wrongly inasmuch as what is to be will be and no amount of consideration will change the ultimate decision. But we know such reasoning is not true, and all unite in respecting those who are sufficiently deliberate in their decisions to choose wisely.

4. **Objections to Free Will Answered.**—The principle of causal-

ity is often cited by necessitarians in objecting to free will as we have defined it. They sometimes state their argument in syllogistic form as follows: Every event must have a cause. Volition is an event. Therefore, it has a cause. We can very readily admit all that is here stated. But when it is assumed that this cause is of such a nature that it may not have been also the cause of another event we disagree. In this the objector begs the question. The cause of the event or volition is free will, which may have put forth a different volition than it did. It is not such a cause as is the knife in the hand of a murderer, but is rather as the power of choice to commit the crime. The objector fails to distinguish between an agent and an intermediate or instrumental cause. If on this principle of causality every volition must have a cause, and, as the necessitarian contends, that cause can be the cause of only one event, then freedom in God when he created the universe is excluded. If his volition to create had a cause that could act only in the one direction, then there is no freedom and all things are the result of necessitated evolution. But even the Calvinist holds will in God is an either-causal power. If then his argument from causality is found to be untrue when applied to God, why assume that will in man also is not a pluripotent cause? We affirm that will is a power of alternativity which man shares with God, a power to create out of nothing as far as subjective determinations are concerned. Therefore it is idle for the necessitarian to object that an event is causeless if another event might as well have been if so willed. The will is first cause and needs no determining, but is determiner.

The foregoing is also the answer to Edward's infinite series objection. This objection endeavors to show the idea of self-determination of the will involves the absurdity that the will must determine itself to will to determine itself to will to determine itself to will endlessly. It takes for granted the point in dispute in assuming that the will must be determined and overlooks the fact that the will does not even so much as determine *itself*, but is the determiner. An example may make the objection more easily grasped. A man chooses to ask God for salvation. The objector says his will is so determined that he chooses, and that if not determined then it must determine itself, but this is an act and so must be the result of a preceding volition to

determine itself and the process must be repeated indefinitely. But the objector's puzzle is no puzzle at all. He errs in assuming that if the will is not determined it must determine itself. It neither determines itself nor is determined, but is itself the *determiner*, and the supposed infinite series has not so much as a beginning.

A third objection to free will, as we have defined it, is an argument from divine prescience. It is reasoned that if God foreknows all human volitions, then those volitions are certain, and it is assumed that if certain they must be necessary. We also affirm that God foreknows all volitions and that they are certain. What will be, will be. None can dispute this. All future events will be in one way and not in two. At one time all events that have ever taken place in the whole universe or that are yet to take place were future and certain. They were certain whether God foreknew them or not. If their certainty implies their necessity, as the determinist holds, then not only the volitions of men, but also those of God, were determined, because his future volitions were as certain as were ours. Therefore to identify certainty with necessity leads inevitably to universal fatalism. This must be the result regardless of the question of divine prescience. This, like other arguments for determinism, leads to complete necessitarianism and proves our contention that the former is practically identical with the latter.

Such an outcome is evidence that something is unsound in this objection from foreknowledge. The error is not in affirming prescience, but in assuming certainty is the same as necessity. To say an event *will be* is not to say it *must be*. An event is necessary only when no power to the contrary exists. A contrary power may exist, yet it may be certain that an event will be even though it may not or need not be. The power to the contrary, or free choice, excludes necessity, but not certainty. Neither does the foreknowledge of an event cause it to be. The knowledge is according to or determined by the event, not the event by the knowledge. Knowledge is not a power of causation; therefore foreknowledge does not make events to be.

Another objection made by determinists with very much confidence is that the divine government over the world is according to a predetermined plan, that it is derogatory to God to suppose he governs the world without a plan, and that he could

not govern according to a plan unless he has absolute control over all wills by determination of their volitions. Freedomists also believe God had a purpose in creating the world and that he governs it in accordance with a plan that will accomplish that purpose. The point at which we take issue with the necessitarian is in his assumption that free will in the subjects of God's government is incompatible with his governing according to a plan. We take exception to his notion of what constitutes government. As in some of his other objections he assumes the point to be proved in supposing God does not govern unless he controls all wills. We distinguish between the rule over things and the government of free beings. An efficient ruler in a civil government does not determine the wills of his subjects. Yet he may have a definite purpose and plan in his governing. He rules in the sense that he has power to hold his subjects accountable to his laws, and is sovereign as long as he is able thus to enforce obedience to his requirements. We deny that determination of men's wills is more honoring to God than his government of free beings as we have described. He who is able to establish and maintain a government over men with free wills is ever accounted greater than one who merely operates a machine. And the determinist's theory amounts to reducing the subjects of God's government to the condition of machinery. To think of God as being able to work out his plan by the government of free moral beings is to honor him immeasurably more than do those who deny him such power in support of what they are pleased to call divine sovereignty.

5. **Real Freedom.**—The freedom thus far described is sometimes called formal freedom to distinguish it from real freedom yet to be described. Formal freedom is concerned with the nature of the will or freedom of the will. In this sense we conceive man has a faculty of alternativity, an either-causal power, or a power to the contrary. His will is not determined to one course, but may choose any of several courses. Such a sense of freedom is the spontaneous impression of men, the testimony of conscience and of the common sense of mankind.

But this formal freedom is not identical with the perfect freedom of Adam as is assumed by Pelagianism. That complete freedom is only possible through God's grace. In describing real freedom we must anticipate the fact of depravity and

restoration through Christ, which are yet to be considered. There is a sense in which men are not naturally free. When Jesus spoke of freedom through the truth the opposing Jews objected that they were Abraham's seed and therefore were never in bondage. But Jesus insisted that there was a freedom through the Son which was freedom "indeed" (John 8:32-36). There is a bondage that consists in the soul's being trammeled with a depravity of nature through sin. Through sinfulness of character the desires are for that which is sinful. This results in an inclination (not a determination) to evil. But through grace this sinful nature may be changed so the heart is no longer inclined to evil. Those so changed are free indeed.

IV. Original Righteousness

1. **Nature of Original Righteousness.**—The question of original righteousness, or primitive holiness as it is sometimes called, is best understood in the light of its history. Four leading views of it have been held, the Romish, the Pelagian, the Augustinian, and that which we shall here set forth as the true view. One's view of original righteousness is determined by one's theory of depravity, and these must in turn determine his teaching concerning the nature of salvation. Because of this fact the subject of original righteousness is not one of mere speculative interest, but has a vital bearing on the great subject of man's salvation, as has been demonstrated in the history of the various theories of it.

In the Roman Catholic view original righteousness consists not in a quality of Adam's essential nature, but in a supernatural endowment *added* after he was created, which was intended to enable him to overcome temptations resulting from certain imperfections in his nature as originally constituted. But no proof can be given that man originally possessed such imperfections in his nature. Then the fall is regarded as only a loss of that added quality and his essential nature was unchanged. This theory supposes his own nature was neither holy before the fall nor depraved after the fall. Their idea of salvation is in harmony with such an idea of what man was both before and after the fall. Such a superadded quality can not properly be called holiness. Pelagius, in his contention with Augustine, unfortunately went to the extreme of denying, not

only Augustine's view of native depravity, but natural depravity of the nature in any sense. In logical consistency with that, he also denied original righteousness in Adam. The Augustinian anthropology holds, not only that the nature of men is totally depraved, but that depravity includes demerit and is punishable. Likewise it assumes original holiness in Adam had ethical value—that it was deserving of reward. Also as depravity is regarded as absolute determination to evil, so original holiness is held to have been a similar determination of Adam to righteousness. On the basis of these is built the doctrine of imputation and that salvation is through divine election alone. In objection to this theory we affirm that as one today can not be properly punished or have demerit because of that for which he is not responsible, so Adam could not have deserved reward for a nature which was his by divine creation.

Whatever was the nature of primitive holiness in Adam it could not have had ethical quality in the sense that it merited reward. Desert of reward can exist only as the result of free choice of that which is right. In the nature of the case, at the moment of creation Adam had not yet made any such choices, so could not have desert of either good or evil; therefore he possessed no ethical quality of holiness. But this does not mean he was characterless, as Pelagians affirm. Holiness may exist in various aspects. In a godly life such as that of the spotless patriarch Joseph, or of Paul, there is a quality of holiness consisting in righteous actions. Such actions are the results of an inner life of holy motives and aspirations. These inner activities are a second aspect of holiness, and because they are the outgrowth of choice have true ethical value. But back of this inner life is yet a third form of holiness—the nature with its spontaneous tendencies.

Since ethical quality is excluded as being the nature of primitive holiness in Adam it must have consisted in a tendency of his nature to that which is good. This tendency to righteousness is to be clearly distinguished from a determination of his will to righteousness, which has been erroneously held by Calvinists. The reality of the distinction in moral tendencies of the natures of men is as certain as is the difference between the tendencies of the lion and the lamb. Evidently such a moral quality or tendency in the nature is possible. If an existing tendency to

evil can be displaced by a bent to righteousness through the operation of divine grace, certainly in man's original creation God was able to implant in his nature a tendency to righteousness. If such tendencies may exist as a result of moral conduct, there is no reason why they may not exist as a result of creation.

If no such tendencies really exist, then holiness inheres only in the quality of acts and not in character. Then we must believe there is no difference in the inner characters of the most devout saint and the most abandoned villain, but that they differ only in their deeds. But Jesus taught that the fruit is according to the tree. "The tree is known by his fruit." The reason for the quality of the fruit is the nature of the tree, a quality which it has in itself even if it bore no fruit. So man's deeds are according to his nature. This leaves no room for the denial of original moral character by Pelagianism, and neither does it favor Augustinianism if it is regarded as a tendency and not a determination of the nature to righteousness. If there be no moral character there can be no regeneration. Original righteousness then must have consisted in a tendency of Adam's nature to holiness, and to this conception we may well add the conception of an indwelling of the Holy Spirit as he is in the fully redeemed through Christ.

2. **Proofs of Original Righteousness.**— The Scriptures teach that as good fruit is the product only of a good tree, so men's good deeds are the result of goodness of character (Luke 6:43-45). If men's good acts are according to their character, certainly the manifestations of goodness in God prove goodness of character in him. Man is said to have been originally created in God's image, and this has already been shown to include moral likeness to God. Therefore man was made originally with a moral nature like God's holy nature, which is proof of original holiness. Again it is said that when man was created he, with other things, was "very good" (Gen. 1:31). We have before shown that in man, who was a moral being, this statement included his moral nature. This statement implies that man had an original righteousness in the sense of a disposition to do good. Still another proof is found in the statement that "God hath made man upright" (Eccl. 7:29). In what sense was man *made* upright? Uprightness can be affirmed of man only in one of three senses—in physical posture, in uprightness of conduct, or in

uprightness of moral character. The context shows the quotation refers not to man's physical structure, but either wholly to his conduct or character. That it does not refer to his conduct is certain because the uprightness implied is one in which "God hath made man," which was before man had performed either good or evil. The only sense left in which man could be properly said to have been created upright is in moral nature. To be upright in original moral nature is to be righteous in moral nature. This is original righteousness.

CHAPTER III

FALL AND DEPRAVITY OF THE RACE

Having shown that, as a product of divine creation, man was constituted a moral being in God's image with conscience, freedom, and a natural bent to righteousness, the next question in logical order that confronts theology for explication is, What is man's natural moral condition at present and what circumstances and events have brought him into that condition? The two phases of the question are better considered in reverse order.

I. Original Probation

Probation for a moral being is a period of testing as to the performance of duty. It involves obligation to obedience to law with a promise of reward for obedience and of penalty for disobedience subsequently to the probationary period. By original probation is meant the state of trial under which our first parents were placed when created.

1. **Probation Requisite for Moral Excellence.**—In the light of the terrible consequences of the original probation the question may well be asked, Why did God place Adam under probation? Evidently God is able to confer on his creatures some sort of happiness without any probation whatever having been endured. But it is equally certain that the highest form of happiness possible is that which comes only to free beings and as a result of the right use of their freedom. This blessedness has the nature of reward. But reward implies desert, desert implies choice, and choice implies the possibility of an alternative. Together these constitute probation. An important element of reward from which much of its blessedness proceeds is the consciousness on the part of the recipient that he merits it. Likewise the sting of the suffering of penalty is largely in the sense of guilt that accompanies it. But one may feel this particular aspect of the blessedness of reward only by having first endured trial. Therefore "blessed is the man that endureth temptation." In Christian experience also blessing usually comes as a consequence of trial. The general laws of life are such that blessedness is consequent on the endurance of trial.

Probation is also needful for the development of moral character. God might have created beings with a different con-

stitution or with such strength of moral character that they would never be conscious of temptation to evil, but to the extent the capacity and opportunity for testing is eliminated, to that extent man's responsibility and moral desert are taken away. As God has created man his character can become confirmed in holiness by a process of testing. As the physical and intellectual powers may be strengthened by severe stress and exercise, so in harmony with this general law of life the powers of the moral nature become strong only by exercise in choosing the right and rejecting the wrong under severe temptation. As the Christian by faithful endurance arrives at a place where certain things cease to tempt him, so it is probable that God intended Adam and Eve should arrive at a state of moral excellence. The Bible seems to intimate that angels were at one time on probation, that some fell, and that those who endured consequently became so confirmed in moral character that they are properly called "holy angels."

In view of these facts it is unreasonable to object to God's placing man under probation. If the divine economy in relation to primitive man is to be questioned, it must be for God's dealing with him as a moral being ought to be dealt with after he was created.

2. **Positive Probationary Law Given.**—The feeling of ought belonged to man's nature as created. He was under the moral law. In the nature of things he owed obedience to his Creator, to whom he was indebted for every benefit. It is altogether reasonable that he should conform to the moral law by doing that which is right in its very nature. But in addition to this God gave a positive law for the purpose of man's probation. As far as the sacred record goes, that law consisted of a single commandment, "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen 2:17). Whether other commands were given or would have been given if man had been faithful in the first test, we are not told. This command may have been recorded because it was the occasion for the fall. It need not be supposed there was any moral evil in eating that forbidden fruit. The commandment was a positive law and its violation was sin only because God had enjoined it.

God had a right as sovereign ruler to enjoin such a law.

Man may not have been able then and may not be able today to explain fully why it should have been given. But the devout person knows a good and wise Creator certainly had a good reason in giving it. In view of the purity of the nature of primitive man and his inexperience it seems probable that such a positive commandment was needful best to test his love for God. He might have been tempted through his sensuous nature or otherwise without it, but with an upright nature and no sinful influences without he doubtless could not otherwise have had the degree of definiteness in his probation which this commandment afforded. Also we may well reason that if Abraham after many years of testing needed for his proper development a positive law as in the command to offer up Isaac, and if Christians need positive law as in the New Testament ordinances, who will dare to say that primitive man did not need a positive law for his testing?

3. **No Injustice in Adam's Probation.**—No objection can be urged against the requirements of God on the ground that it was impossible for primitive man to comply with them. In his own nature as a free agent he was free to obey the testing law. Besides, he also had a natural tendency to obey. The requirement was clearly pointed out, so it was possible for any rational mind to comprehend it. It was not a command to do something that required effort, but merely to refrain from doing what he had no need whatever to do. God desired and urged obedience by threatening death for disobedience and therefore by implication promising life for obedience. Great happiness in Eden was made possible through compliance with God's requirement. There was no necessity for disobedience. The fruit of all the other trees of the garden was provided for food. These are described as "every tree that is pleasant to the eyes and good for food." Full satisfaction was possible to primitive man without violating the divine injunction not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The probation of our first parents was neither unreasonable, unnecessary, nor unjust.

II. Origin and Nature of Sin

1. **Nature of the First Temptation.**—The Mosaic account of the temptation and fall of primitive man is briefly that the newly created man and woman were placed in a beautiful garden where

among other trees were the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Of the fruit of the latter tree they were divinely forbidden to eat lest they die. Through the temptation of the serpent the woman ate of it and gave to her husband, who ate also; in consequence of which they incurred the divine displeasure, were expelled from Eden, and became subject to death.

Three main classes may be distinguished among interpreters of the Biblical account of the fall—those who regard it as literal history, those who make it an allegory, and those who affirm it is only a myth. Those who view it as mythical are rationalists. That it is neither a myth nor an allegory, but literal history, is evident for various reasons.

It is an integral part of a continuous history. The Book of Genesis professes to be literal history. No hint is given that the account of the fall is allegorical or other than history. Therefore if the record of the fall may be interpreted as a fable or allegory other parts of the book may be so interpreted. If Adam is a symbolic man why should not Abraham and other patriarchs be so regarded? But that Abraham is a historical character is evident, and it is reasonable to regard Adam as also historical inasmuch as he is described in the same continuous narrative. And this account of the fall is an essential part, not only of the Book of Genesis, but of the Bible history as a whole. It is the foundation and starting-point of all the history recorded in the Scriptures, and as such is referred to, not only in the Old, but also in the New Testament (Rom. 5:12-19, 1 Tim. 2:13, 14). Jesus and the apostles make the fall described in Genesis the ground for man's universal sinfulness and need of salvation through Christ. Any writer who should mix true history with allegory without giving any intimation of transition from the one to the other must necessarily be regarded as unintelligible. Neither the inspiring Spirit nor the learned writer of Genesis can be supposed to have been a party to such literary incongruities.

Therefore we may as reasonably regard Eden as a literal garden as to think of Canaan mentioned in the same book as a literal land. In the midst of the garden grew two trees, the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. By eating of the fruit of the former, either because of its inherent virtue or because of a sacramental character conferred upon it,

man's body might be preserved in life and strength indefinitely. It is not unreasonable to suppose the Almighty created in its fruit intrinsic qualities that would rejuvenate man's physical body. With evidence that the garden was literal, this fruit must be regarded as literal because it was necessary to expel Adam and Eve from Eden after they sinned lest they should eat of it and live forever.

For similar reasons the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is to be thought of as a literal tree. We may not be certain that knowledge of good and evil consequent upon eating it was the result of the nature of the fruit. It seems more probable that its fruit had no peculiar qualities in itself, but that the restriction concerning its fruit was arbitrarily made of God for man's testing. The woman saw that the tree was "good for food and pleasant to the eyes." In this view the eating of its fruit imparted the knowledge of good and evil only in the sense that by disobeying God concerning it our foreparents came to an experimental knowledge of the difference between good and evil.

In harmony with what has been said we are obligated to understand the statement that a serpent spoke to Eve as referring to a literal serpent. We can not properly think of it as a figurative name for Satan, nor yet that Satan assumed the form of a serpent. The fact that the curse was pronounced upon the animal itself is proof it was a literal serpent. The question as to what kind of animal is referred to or what was its original form is not pertinent to our purpose. But the serpent alone could have been only an *instrument* in the temptation. Evidently Satan himself was the *agent* of it. Not only is the serpent without the power of speech, as is often objected, but the intelligence displayed by the tempter relative to the divine injunction far exceeded that of any irrational animal, even the most subtle. It is true the Bible nowhere directly states that the serpent was an instrument of Satan, but it is often assumed in the New Testament (Rev. 12:9; 20:2; Rom. 16:20; John 8:44). Satan could as easily talk through a serpent as he did through the demoniacs whom Jesus healed.

The first stage of the temptation was to cause Eve to doubt God's goodness, the second was to beget in her mind unbelief concerning the truthfulness of God's warning of death for eat-

ing, the third was to awaken in her an ambition to be like God, which was prompted by sinful pride. In spite of alleged difficulties in the narrative of that primitive temptation, taken altogether it is in nowise incredible to those not predetermined to unbelief.

2. **Man's Fall and Its Effects.**—The fact of man's fall is not only clearly revealed in the Bible, but the consequences of it are so evident in human nature that its reality is commonly recognized. The fall of the primitive pair was by deliberate, intentional violation of the divine commandment. Though the act of eating the forbidden fruit may have been insignificant in itself, yet its consequences were of incomparable importance. Their act implied a flagrant rejection of their Creator, contempt for his good law, and a love of things and self more than of God.

The penalty threatened for violation of the probationary injunction was death. As the term was used in this connection, death doubtless included much more than physical death. The penalty for that transgression was severe, and rightly so because of the enormity of the crime. Adam and Eve questioned God's goodness in withholding from them certain powers, though he had given them every good they possessed. They were guilty of extreme infidelity in believing Satan rather than God. They were envious and sought to steal what God had reserved to himself as sovereign by seeking to be like him through violating his law. The death that was visited upon man was threefold. Perpetual life had been provided for him in Eden. Through sin physical death entered into the world by his exclusion from the tree of life. The second sense of that penal death is spiritual death, or the separation from God, whose presence is essential to the realization of spiritual life or that life in which the spirit rules. Death is the wages of sin (Rom. 6:23). The apostle Paul said of his experience of coming to feel moral responsibility, "Sin revived, and I died" (Rom. 7:9). Physical death was not inflicted at once, because of God's redemptive grace to be offered. For the same reason though spiritual death at once became actual, yet it did not become an irrecoverable state. The third sense of death was eternal death or eternal separation from God, which became actual only in case God's offered grace was finally rejected.

Not only did man become subject to physical death, but his body became subject to disease and pain, and his physical powers became weakened insomuch that often he is scarcely able to perform the duties of life which devolve upon him. Doubtless the mind has also been affected adversely by the fall. In men generally may be observed dullness of the perceptive faculty, a lack of balance in judgment, incapacity to remember facts of practical importance which should be remembered, or enfeebled powers of reasoning. Surely such weakness did not characterize primitive man when God pronounced him very good. The curse upon man after his apostasy included certain changes in external nature such as the thorns and thistles the ground brought forth, but to what extent the animal and vegetable orders and inorganic nature were changed is not revealed. Evidently such knowledge is not necessary to our salvation. The moral effects of the fall will be discussed later.

3. **Nature of Sin.**—Of fundamental importance to any system of theology is the question What is sin? It demands consideration, not only by theology, but also by philosophy. The present consideration of sin is from the Biblical viewpoint. Sin in its primary sense is a want of conformity to law. It is the opposite of holiness, which was defined, when we discussed it as a divine attribute, as being conformity to law. The term "sin" is used in two senses—(1) of conduct, and (2) of character. In the first, which is the primary use, it is commonly expressed in the New Testament by the Greek term ἀνομία (*anomia*) which means contrary to law or without law. Sin in this sense has to do only with conduct, not in the narrow sense of mere muscular action, but in the broader sense as including thoughts, motives and volitions. In this sense it is often called actual transgression to distinguish it from sinfulness of character, which is frequently termed original sin or natural depravity. In this latter or secondary sense it has to do with what one *is* rather than with what he *does*. Another Greek term ἁμαρτία (*hamartia*) is ordinarily used in the New Testament to describe this unholiness of character. Examples of the use of this Greek word are as follows: "When the commandment came, sin revived, and I died" (Rom. 7:9). "Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me" (v. 17). Here sin, ἁμαρτία (*hamartia*) is evidently used to designate a derangement or depravity of the nature. In one

place, 1 John 3:4, ἁμαρτία (*hamartia*, sin) is used as a synonym of ἀνομία (*anomia*) and is said to be ἀνομία (*anomia*), or a transgression of the law.

Sin in conduct may be by commission—doing what should not be done; or by omission—failing to do what should be done. Two standards may be distinguished for judging as to what is sinful—(1) sin in the abstract or absolute sense, and (2) sin in the concrete or imputed sense. In the first view acts are judged in relation to principles of right apart from the actor's knowledge or motives in performing them. For example according to this view to speak falsely is regarded as sin even though the speaker is ignorant of the fact that he speaks falsely and intends to speak only the truth.

According to the second view, which is the sense in which sin is commonly used of conduct in the New Testament, only those acts are sinful which are prompted by wrong motives. In this view sin is imputed as guilt to one only according to his knowledge or intentions. That which is right in itself is imputed as sin to one who esteems it to be evil when he performs it. Such is the teaching of the apostle Paul in regard to the eating of meats and the observing of days. "To him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean" (Rom. 14:14). Likewise, if for lack of knowledge one does with a good motive that which is in itself a violation of principles of right, it is not imputed to him as sin, because of his good motive in doing it. In this sense sin is a violation of the obligation of supreme love to God, which is the first and greatest commandment and on which all others hang. Imputed sin in conduct, then, is a rebellious attitude of heart toward God.

Therefore, sin is imputed to its perpetrator as such only when he feels a sense of moral obligation, and voluntarily chooses that which he believes to be wrong. It is not required that he shall have performed an outward sinful act or spoken an evil word. He may sin in thought. "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Matt. 5:28). Sin is committed in the volition to do what is esteemed to be wrong. Temptation is not sin. When Eve considered the words of the serpent and felt the desire for the forbidden fruit she had not yet committed sin. She incurred no guilt until of her own free will she decided to

do what God had forbidden. God was responsible for the primitive probation. Satan tempted Eve. But neither the fact of probation nor the temptation were determinative of the woman's conduct. She determined that herself. Therefore God is not the author of sin, but man is wholly responsible for it.

4. **Sin not a Divine Method.**—Among the many attempts to explain the divine permission of the origin of moral evil, one of the most common is the theory that God permitted sin on the part of the human race as a part of his plan that he might in turn provide redemption and by such a manifestation of divine goodness, love, and holiness bring blessings to mankind they could not otherwise enjoy. This view has been supported by not a few eminent thinkers of the Reformed Church and even by John Wesley. Such a divine ordering of sin is supposed to be productive of a degree of faith and love in men not otherwise attainable by making known the perfect goodness and holiness of God. Also it is assumed that by experience of suffering because of sin men are enabled to develop a degree of gentleness, meekness, long-suffering, and patience that could be possessed in no other way. Doubtless there are elements of truth in this theory; still we regard it as not only unprovable, but as open to serious objections.

First it represents the Scriptures with their denunciations of sin as being deceitful. It charges them with insincerity, if sin is of God and ordained by him to accomplish righteousness. If we must think of sin as useful it is not possible to think according to facts when in a Biblical frame of mind. It represents God as hypocritical, as being on both sides of an ethical question at the same time. It makes him to decree that a man commit sin and then forbid that he do it under the threat of endless punishment. The theory holds that sin was necessary that the justice and love of God might be exhibited in dealing with sinners in opposite ways. Yet it fails to show either love or justice in God, but instead exhibits only a sole arbitrary divine will. To say that God ordained sin that good might result is equal to saying he caused it. But if God is the cause of sin he can not be regarded as holy. A theory which results in a denial of God's holiness must be rejected as unbiblical. It is unreasonable that sin, the greatest evil, is necessary to the greatest good. If it be true that God must choose sin to accomplish good he is

limited in his methods and can not be regarded as absolute. That God ordains evil that good may result is contradictory to both the Bible and man's highest moral sense.

Concerning the theory that an experience in sin is needful for man's moral training, it may be allowed that since sin exists God may make it to contribute to the ethical training of those who will serve him, but this is far from saying that sin is necessary to such training or that much better results might not have resulted if there had been no fall. If experience in sin is essential to the development of high moral character, how shall we account for the perfect character of Christ? It is not experience in sin, but ceaseless struggle against temptation to it, that develops moral character. Opportunity for such resistance to temptation was furnished by God's placing man on probation, but there was no need that sin should ever be committed for all the benefit that was to be derived from struggling against it. Whatever incentive to love and faith may be afforded by the manifestation of the divine goodness in the redemptive work of Christ is probably overbalanced by the loss of capacity in a degree for both love and faith which resulted from the fall.

The more Scriptural view and one which harmonizes with the ethical sense of mankind is that God is absolutely opposed to sin, and all his relations to it are only by way of prevention, remedy, or punishment. God created man a moral being with full freedom to choose the right and to abstain from the wrong, gave him a holy nature with a bent to righteousness, but placed him under a probationary law for his testing with a preference for his obedience. God was in no wise responsible for man's sin, but only for making sinning possible, which was a necessary consequence of man's having been constituted a moral being. God permitted sin in this sense, but man was entirely free in falling and wholly responsible for it.

III. Nature of Original Sin

1. **Sense of the Term.**—Among the terms used to designate that sinfulness of human nature resulting from the sin of our first parents are: original sin, Adamic sin, native depravity, inherited, inbred, or indwelling sin, the carnal nature, and the flesh. Though they have all been used in religious and doctrinal statements more or less indiscriminately, yet they are not all synonymous. Original, Adamic, inherited, inbred, or indwelling

sin in their broadest usage include whatever sin, either guilt or evil tendency, is conceived to attach to one at his birth. Native depravity has a narrower meaning as designating in no sense guilt for Adam's sin, but only a natural or inherited evil tendency of human nature. The carnal or fleshly nature is a Biblical term which is usually understood to refer to the evil tendency of the natures of men. The term "flesh" is used by the inspired writers in this figurative sense doubtless because the physical desires are so often the medium through which the depraved nature operates.

Original sin has been used more than any other term to represent natural sinfulness. Its use in this sense may be traced back to Tertullian. Augustine, who gave it special prominence, and those who hold the Augustinian anthropology have ever used it to include, not only depravity of the moral nature, but also ill desert of that depravity as well as guilt for Adam's first sin. Augustinians understand original sin to include at least these three ideas. In our present use of the term we exclude the idea of guilt and make it to include and to be synonymous with native depravity. Because of its more specific sense we prefer ordinarily to use native depravity. What then is the nature of original sin used in this sense?

2. **A Derangement of the Moral Nature.**—Depravity is certain as to its reality, though it is not easily grasped by thought as to its nature. But the difficulty of apprehending its nature can not properly be made an objection to the fact of its reality. Many facts are known as to their certainty while their mode is altogether inscrutable. That man thinks is undeniable, but how he thinks is unknowable. We know the mind is a reality by its phenomena, but what it is is beyond the grasp of thought. Likewise the reality of depravity is known by its activities, though its exact nature is probably not accurately and fully definable.

Evidently depravity can not properly be thought of as a physical entity. Neither is it a spiritual existence or faculty added to man's spiritual being. It is rather a state or condition of the moral nature. It may be illustrated by that which causes the nature of the lion to differ from the nature of the lamb. The nature of the lion is to be ferocious, but the nature of the lamb is to be docile. We know the distinction is real. Likewise some

men's lives are good and upright, while those of others are sinful and vile. Those who are good in their conduct are so because it is their nature to be good. Those who are sinful are sinful because their inner nature in sinful. But man as originally created is represented in the Scriptures as being holy. Therefore inherited sinful nature must be a result of a depravity or derangement of the moral nature. This derangement consists principally in the perversion of those three faculties which go to constitute man a moral being—the conscience, the affections, and the will.

(1) *The conscience is seared.* Depravity does not consist of a loss of the moral faculty of conscience. Most men, though sinful, and depraved, are clearly conscious of the voice of conscience. But it is also a fact of human experience generally recognized that in most men conscience does not function effectually. It is evidently in a weakened, abnormal state. In some persons it is much less efficient than in others. Some who make no profession of Christianity, and who recognize depravity in themselves in other respects, have a very tender conscience that keeps them from doing many sins that others freely indulge in without compunction. Other persons have so often disregarded conscience that it is seared. They commit the most atrocious crimes apparently without any feeling of remorse. This variability of the efficiency of conscience is partly acquired, but much of it characterizes persons from infancy. This is to be accounted for on the ground of degrees of depravity in different individuals. Such a lack of efficient functioning of conscience in any degree is an element in constituting depravity of the nature.

In all of its functions—discriminative, impulsive, and retributive—conscience is found to be deficient. It often fails to discriminate between the right and the wrong. This is principally due to the weakening of the sense of right. The prevalence of sin on every hand is certainly proof that conscience is inefficient in impelling to the right. Perversion of the conscience is also evident from the fact that men intentionally violate God's laws without compunction. Because of depravity the voice of conscience with most men is usually no more than a whisper instead of a strong, stern voice of command.

(2) *The affections are perverted.* The most noticeable and probably the most definite manifestation of depravity is in the

perversion of the affections. The Scriptures commonly describe this feature of depravity as a sinful heart. "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." Man was made to love God, but he bestows the love that properly belongs to his Creator on the creature instead, and especially does he love himself. Selfishness largely dominates the natural heart. The sinful heart is prone to forget the Giver of good things in a selfish grasping for the things themselves. Likewise depravity causes one to love himself *more than* his neighbor, rather than *as* his neighbor. Surely this inordinate selfishness did not characterize man in the time of his original holiness, but must be referred to present depravity.

As a result of this element of selfishness that deranges the emotional nature, many particular emotions which are right in themselves are so perverted that they either give a tendency to evil or are evil in themselves. Men naturally have a desire to be pleasing to their fellow men, which is evidently desirable and good. Such a disposition is the natural result of loving others more than oneself. But inordinate self-love will cause one to desire to be, not only pleasing to others, but more pleasing to them than any one else. This will lead to envy, jealousy, and pride, which are forms of selfishness. There is a natural pride or self-respect, that is legitimate, but when it comes to be based upon selfishness it is sinful. Another example of the effect of depravity is the disposition to acquire things. This disposition to be provident is legitimate and desirable. But through selfishness it degenerates into a desire to acquire things for their own sake and becomes covetousness.

The emotion of anger is right and desirable in itself if it be merely as a feeling of indignation consequent on a sense of outraged justice. This sense of justice is an essential of human nature. It is necessary to moral being. When gross injustice is done against either oneself or another, one naturally has feelings of disapproval. In themselves such feelings are good and necessary to personal goodness. But when they include an element of vindictiveness calling for revenge they are evil. Vindictive anger is not possible when one loves others as he loves himself.

(3) *The will is enslaved.* A third aspect of the derangement of the nature is the enslavement of the will. This does not

mean that the power of choice is lost through sin or that the will ceases to be a power of alternative choice. By constant yielding to the desires of the lower nature the will becomes weakened in power effectually to volitionate that which is good. From birth the will is so weakened. Some theologians locate depravity exclusively in the will while others deny a depraved condition of the will. The former regard the will as inclined to evil. But all impulse and inclination are in the sensibilities. The will is not a personal agency, but merely the power of choice. Therefore the will is affected by depravity only mediately through the sensibilities. Because the sensuous nature is perverted the will fails to function as it should in moral volitions.

3. **A Loss of the Holy Spirit.**—Depravity is not a subtraction from nor an addition to any natural power of man's spiritual nature. The intellectual, emotional, and volitional faculties remain constitutionally as they were created. They are affected only as to condition, not as to their existence. But only of natural powers can it be said there has been no subtraction or addition. Supernaturally sin causes both a subtraction and an addition. Consistency requires that depravity be defined in harmony with the nature of original holiness. Original righteousness was described, not only as a natural tendency to righteousness, but also as including the presence and power of the Holy Spirit. Depravity then is not only a natural tendency to sin, but also a deprivation of the power and communion of the Spirit of God. He could not dwell with a sinful soul. And to anticipate the consideration of the nature of the work of salvation, it consists in not only the restoration of the nature to right tendencies, but also an incoming of the presence and power of the Holy Ghost. Because of this loss of the Holy Spirit through the fall, depravity has been described as "depravation through deprivation." Still another aspect of the nature of depravity is found in the fact that as man was originally under the influence of the Holy Spirit so through the derangement of the nature the spirit of Satan is furnished an opportunity to influence him. Unregenerate man is in a measure under the control of, and possessed by, the devil. Therefore as to supernatural effects depravity includes both a subtraction and an addition.

4. **A Bent to Sin a Result of Depravity.**—Because of this derangement of the nature, the loss of the presence of God, and

the consequent influence of the Evil One, depraved man has a tendency to commit sin. It is not strictly accurate to say depravity is a tendency to evil. It is more proper to state that it *causes* man to have a tendency to evil. The constituent nature of depravity is back of this tendency as before described. Yet the point of practical importance is this effect of depravity, a tendency to do that which is evil.

IV. Extent of Native Depravity

1. **The Question of Total Depravity.**—The question is one concerning which much theological controversy has raged in the past. That man is totally depraved has been very strongly advocated by Calvinists. This theory is essential to the Augustinian theology. It is one of the principal arguments for that other essentially Calvinistic theory—predestination. It is assumed that man is totally depraved, unable to choose any good; therefore only as God, of his own sovereign will, chooses to save men will they ever be saved. Arminian theology, especially in more recent times, has rejected the idea of total depravity in the sense in which Calvinism holds it.

Because of this controversy and the varying senses in which total depravity has been affirmed, the term itself has come to be ambiguous. Therefore the question "Is man totally depraved?" can not well be answered satisfactorily with either yes or no. In what sense then may it be properly said that man is totally depraved, and in what sense is he not totally depraved? In respect to the effects of sin upon the moral nature as heretofore described, depravity is not total. The moral nature is deranged, but it is not entirely destroyed. Conscience is weakened in all its aspects, but in depraved men it still performs its functions in a measure. The affections are alienated from God and centered upon self, yet unregenerate men are not wholly selfish. The will is enslaved, but it is not altogether powerless in moral volitions. Even though man is depraved by being deprived of the power of the divine Spirit to keep him from sin, yet he is not wholly deprived of divine influences, for the Spirit still convicts him of sin and his need of God.

But total depravity is usually affirmed in the sense that man is altogether powerless to choose the right. Calvinists hold that man is totally unable to choose to serve God, and therefore that

one's obtaining salvation is wholly dependent upon the will of God. The Calvinistic theory we reject as being contradictory to the common teaching of the Scriptures that salvation is offered to whosoever will accept it, and that therefore men have power to accept or reject it. This is in agreement with the idea of free will as we have represented it. Yet it is true that men can come to Christ for salvation only as drawn by the Father. As God draws men to Christ they must accept if they are to be saved. In the sense that men can choose salvation only by the help of God, they might be said to be totally depraved. But if by total depravity is meant that man lacks power of alternative choice, as Calvinism holds, then we deny that man is totally depraved.

Unregenerate men may also be described as totally depraved in the sense that they do not have power to refrain from all sinning. This truth is set forth with vividness and force in the seventh chapter of Romans. As a result of the perversion of the affections and the consequent dominance of the lower nature, the will unassisted can not effectually volitionate against evil. One can only will to let God save him. He can not save himself. No process of culture or of growth into regeneration is possible. The words of Jesus are true concerning all men, "Ye must be born again."

2. **Degrees of Depravity.**—The theory of total depravity allows no room for degrees of depravity either native or acquired. Depravity viewed as a derangement of the moral nature may exist in different individuals in varying degrees. Evidently some persons are more depraved than are others. The hardened criminal is more depraved than the innocent child. His conscience is less sensitive, his affections are more perverted, his will is more enslaved by sin, and he is less susceptible to the drawings of God's Spirit than is the child.

Two aspects of depravity may be distinguished—inherited and acquired. All men are depraved in some degree from birth. But this natural depravity may be increased in degree indefinitely by indulgence in sin. This is evident both from the nature of depravity and also from observation and experience. Therefore degrees may be distinguished, not only in acquired depravity, but also in inherited derangement of the moral faculties. Observation shows that some persons are naturally more conscientious than are others. Others are naturally more selfish,

and their wills are more enslaved to the lower desires. They are less inclined to morals and religion and more inclined to sin. Doubtless these degrees in native depravity as distinguished from acquired are to be explained on the ground that especially the immediate and probably the more remote ancestors were more sinful in the cases of those who are born more depraved.

V. Proofs of Native Depravity

The reality of human depravity, that the moral natures of men are naturally in a deranged condition, is so evident that citation of proofs is almost superfluous. The sinfulness of human nature has been more or less distinctly recognized by mankind generally. Its reality is evident, not only from the Bible, but also from the facts of life and experience. From both sources the proofs are very many. A few only are given here.

1. **Expressly Taught in the Bible.**—In both the Old and New Testaments may be found direct Scripture proofs of depravity. Not merely the conduct of men, but also their hearts are described as evil. "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" (Jer. 17:9). "The heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil" (Eccl. 8:11). "Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (Gen. 6:5). "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth" (Gen. 8:21). Here man's heart, or affectional nature, that which gives motive for action, is represented as being sinful. All the vile sins of the antediluvians are referred to the evil tendency of a sinful heart as their source. These affirmations of sinfulness of the hearts of men can not be reasonably understood of depravity acquired by their individual conduct, for the general sinfulness of heart here described is rationally possible only on the ground that such sinful character is native to them. The last text definitely declares that men's hearts are evil from their *youth*.

A very direct affirmation of native depravity is given by David in his penitential psalm. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Psa. 51:5). In the verses preceding and following this statement David in deepest contrition acknowledges the vileness of his sins and implores pardon. As a further humiliation he goes a step further and describes himself as having been sinful in his very

nature from his earliest existence. Again the Psalmist says, "The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies" (Psa. 58:3). Evidently no actual sin can be committed by people as soon as they are born and not until they come to the age of moral responsibility. This estrangement from the womb, then, can refer only to a native tendency to evil. Such an interpretation must be the correct one, as no other is consistent with all the facts in the case.

In referring to the former conduct of himself and fellow Christians at Ephesus the apostle Paul said, "And were by nature the children of wrath, even as others" (Eph. 2:3). "By nature" means by birth. When Paul said of himself and Peter that they were "Jews by nature" (Gal. 2:15) he meant they were Jews by birth, not by proselytism. So the Ephesian saints were by birth the children of wrath, or sinful by nature. As already shown, such sinfulness can not be committed sin; therefore this text must assert that men are depraved from birth. The same truth is set forth in Rom. 7:9: "I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." The only time Paul was without the law was during infancy before he understood its commandments. But when he came to know the commandments as God's law to him, he at once sinned and suffered sin's consequences, spiritual death. But when the commandment came, "sin revived," which implies that sin was in him. That indwelling sin could be only native depravity.

2. **Clearly Implied in the Scriptures.**—Depravity, like the truth of the divine existence and many other of the most important truths of Revelation, is more frequently assumed, implied, and referred to incidentally than it is directly affirmed. Jesus clearly recognized the reality of depravity of heart when he said, "Out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: all these things come from within, and defile the man" (Mark 7:21-23). If man were naturally innocent, as is held by Pelagians, then these evil things must originate from *without,* but Jesus said they come from *within,* implying that men are depraved. Similarly Jesus taught that a man, like a tree, is known by his

fruits. "A good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. For every tree is known by his own fruit. For of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes. A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil: for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh" (Luke 6:43-45). Nothing can be clearer than that Jesus here tells us that the cause of sinfulness of conduct is sinfulness of nature. Men sin because it is their nature to sin, as an apple-tree bears apples because it is its nature to bear apples. As evil fruit is the result of an evil tree, so sin is a result of sinfulness in one's nature. The stream is like the fountain from which it flows. One's conduct can be good only as his heart is good. "Cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean" (Matt. 23:26).

In conformity with the foregoing is the implication of depravity in all those texts of the New Testament which state that all men are sinners. "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one" (Rom. 3:9, 10). "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23). In the first chapter of Romans Paul has shown that the Gentiles as a class are given to vile sins. In the second chapter he shows the Jews as a class are equally sinful. In these verses quoted from the third chapter he refers to that proof and affirms that both Jews and Gentiles are sinful. His reasoning is not that individuals may not be saved from sinning through grace, but that all are naturally sinful and need the special grace of God. This same truth of universal human sinfulness is found in other places in the Scriptures (Job 14:4; 15:15. I John 1:7, 9).

3. **Ground for the Need of Regeneration.**—No righteousness is possible to men by doing the works of the law. This is a truth declared again and again by the Apostle in the epistles to the Romans and Galatians and elsewhere. "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight" (Rom. 3:20). "A man is not justified by the works of the law" (Gal. 2:16). "For if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law" (Gal. 3:21). The reason the law could not give life was because righteous-

ness by the law was not possible. It was not possible because men do not possess power to keep the law. This is clearly shown, especially in the seventh chapter of Romans. There is described the experience of the unregenerate person who endeavors to find justification by obedience to the law. But obedience is found to be impossible. In his failure he exclaims, "The good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do" (v. 19). The cause of his failure is described in the next verse as being "sin that dwelleth in me." This indwelling sin can be nothing else than an evil bent of the nature. The remedy for it is found in Christ, as set forth in Rom. 8:2. "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." With pardon through faith in Christ must also come regeneration by the Holy Spirit in order to have power for obedience.

"Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3). This new birth or regeneration is elsewhere called receiving a new heart, or becoming a new creature. This is a divine work in one's inner nature, affecting his character, and is to be clearly distinguished from pardon of committed sins, which has to do with effecting right relations with God. But why must one be born again? Evidently because naturally he was born with a sinful nature, and needs to have it renovated by the power of a new birth. Naturally men are evil, and therefore need to become new creatures, or to have a new heart. The fact of depravity is fundamental to Christian doctrine. If there were no depravity there could be no regeneration. But the doctrine of regeneration is certain in the Scriptures. Therefore in every text which teaches the new birth is also implied the truth of native depravity.

4. **Universality of Sinning.**—Though native depravity is more clearly set forth in the Bible than it can be known merely from observation and experience, yet as is true of many other religious truths the reality of it is certain independently of revelation. Human experience at the present and all past history of the race testify to universal sinning. From the time wicked Cain slew his brother until the present the pages of history have been one long record of crime—cruelty, oppression, bloodshed, war, hatred, licentiousness, deceit, falsehood, and covetousness. Excepting the sinless Son of Man and those saved by divine

grace, no sinless man has yet been found. The best of unregenerate men admit their lives have not been without sin. If one who had come to the age of manhood *without regeneration* should testify to having been always sinless he would not only contradict the moral judgment of all men, but they would consider such a claim sinful in itself. Truly, "there is no man that sinneth not" but "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." "If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar."

The fact of universal sinning is properly referable to universal sinfulness. The tree is like its fruits. Men sin because it is their nature to sin. An evil bent of the nature is the only adequate account of the prevalence of sin. The Pelagian theory that widespread sinning is due to imitation, education, and example fails adequately to account for all the facts. Men imitate evil examples more readily than the good. Therefore they must have a natural tendency to evil rather than good. And though the constant effort of parents and educators is to train to virtue and away from vice, yet their efforts are often comparatively fruitless. And if sinning is to be referred to imitation, education, and example, how did sin begin to be more prevalent than virtue?

In addition to the necessity of accounting for the amount of sin committed, is also the need of an adequate reason for crimes of great enormity. Evidently one can commit very great sin only by first committing lesser sins that harden the heart, callous the conscience, and blunt the moral sense. But if there were no natural tendency to evil it is altogether improbable that so large a number of persons should persist in sinning until sins of great enormity are possible.

5. **Sinning in Spite of Restraints.**—A very strong tendency to commit sin is manifested in men's sinning constantly against many restraints. God has threatened and frequently inflicted terrible punishment for sin. His laws are all directed against sin to cause men to refrain from it. The preaching of the gospel is calculated to check it. The goodness of God shown in nature and the gospel offer of pardon should persuade men to virtue. Conscience thunders against sin and when it is committed lashes the culprit mercilessly, yet men continue to sin. They sin in spite of the enactment of civil laws against those sins they commit. Men's own interests, self-respect, good-will of friends,

reputation, and the observed evil effects of sin on health, wealth, character, and domestic happiness are all restraints to sinning. Yet men sin. The only adequate explanation of a practise so unreasonable is that it is the nature of men to sin.

6. **A Natural Tendency to Sin.**—Observation shows that from earliest childhood a disposition to commit sin exists. In mere infants are displayed selfishness, hatred, deceit, falsehood, pride, envy, resentment, and cruelty. The chief purpose of moral training is to curb these evil tendencies. But in spite of all that can be done by parents and teachers united with all one can do in later life by way of self-culture, attempts at reformation are attended with great difficulty and meager fruits. Good resolutions are made only to be broken. Religious agencies are comparatively ineffectual to effect reformation. The only reasonable explanation of these facts is that men are naturally disposed to evil.

Men are conscious of a tendency to do evil. Some recognize themselves disposed to one sin, some to another. But all possess and most men recognize in a measure a tendency to commit sin and to forget God. They know, not only that they *do* wrong, but that they *are* wrong. Revelation, experience, and consciousness all unite in testifying to a native derangement of man's moral nature.

Chapter IV

MODE OF TRANSMISSION OF ORIGINAL SIN

Evidently the Scriptures teach that the present depravity and sinfulness of the race is a consequence of the first sin of Adam. Christians generally have united in holding this view. But what is that relation of Adam to his posterity which has resulted in entailing these awful consequences upon his descendants? What is the philosophy of the transmission of depravity from Adam to the race? Various theories of the mode of the transmission of depravity have been propounded. Both as a help in distinguishing the true mode and also because of the large influence of other theories on Christian thought, some acquaintance with them is important. But to understand the theories of the mode of the transmission of depravity the different theories of the nature of depravity must first be understood.

I. Theories of Original Sin

Three main theories concerning the nature and extent of depravity have been given prominence—(1) the Pelagian, (2) the Augustinian, and (3) the Arminian, as they have been called after those who first formulated them. Semi-Pelagianism might also be named as a fourth theory, but this may be classed with Arminianism, to which it is somewhat similar.

1. **Pelagian Theory.**—Pelagius was a British monk who went to Rome about the beginning of the fifth century, where, because of his even temperament and purity of life, he won great esteem. The laxity of morals he observed there even among the clergy he attributed to the teaching of moral helplessness through depravity. Having a naturally mild disposition and consequently no such sense of helplessness in his own experience, he advanced the extreme theory that there is no native depravity; that the sin of Adam resulted in the fall of himself alone; that the new-born child is characterless, as he affirmed was also Adam when created; that each individual has a natural power of unhampered free choice; and that sin consists in acts, not in a tendency of the nature, except as the will of him who sins might form the habit of sinning. In short, he denied that Adam's sin had any effect on his posterity morally, mentally, or physically, except that Adam set an evil example by sinning. Even

physical death he disallowed was a penalty for sin, holding that from the first mortality of the body was natural and would certainly become actual.

Such a theory is so thoroughly contradictory to the common experience of mankind, who constantly struggle against evil desires and passions, that its adherents have never been numerous. All the proofs of native depravity previously given are opposed to Pelagianism. Though Pelagius was orthodox in his belief in the divine Trinity, yet his theory naturally affiliates with rationalism and is held today principally by Unitarians and other liberalists. Its denial of depravity of the nature excludes the idea of regeneration, and makes a place for the theory that salvation is purely a process of education—the theory of Unitarianism. With them Christ is not a priest or atoner, but only a prophet or teacher. By excluding native depravity it necessarily has no room for a theory of the mode of the transmission of depravity.

2. **Augustinian Theory.**—The opposite extreme of the Pelagian anthropology is the Augustinian. When Pelagius began to advocate his theory in North Africa he met in Augustine the most effectual opposer of his views. Unlike Pelagius, Augustine had struggled long and vainly against evil passions which vanquished him. He had proved by experience that only the grace of God was sufficient to save him from a profligate life to which he felt impelled by a sinful nature. As with Pelagius, Augustine's experience was reflected in his teaching. His personal experience and especially the conflict with Pelagianism led him to adopt a system as extreme and erroneous as that he opposed.

The following are the distinguishing features in the Augustinian system: (1) Adam was the race, or represented it, and the whole human family had their only probation in him. (2) He was created with original righteousness, which consisted in a determination to holiness, but for probationary purposes he was given a power to the contrary which he was forbidden to use, but which he did use and consequently lost to himself and his descendants. (3) As a result of his sin he became guilty and depraved, and because he was the race all men became also depraved, guilty, and punishable for his sin because they are said to have sinned in him. Then original sin is both guilt and depravity. (4) That depravity is total, and it is said that man

has no power to volitionate good or choose to be saved. (5) Salvation is therefore by the sole choice and working of the Spirit of God, and man can in no wise cooperate with that efficacious, irresistible grace which leads him to will to repent and obey God. (6) When by his sovereign grace God has saved those whom he has elected to save all others are reprobated to eternal death.

"The innovating character of Augustinianism is beyond question. His more extreme tenets are not to be found with a single one of the preceding fathers" (H. C. Sheldon, History of Christian Doctrine, Vol. I, p. 234). The Augustinian theology was widely accepted for some time following its first promulgation, but with the large majority was gradually given up until the catholic belief was much what it had been before Augustine's time. During the Reformation John Calvin again brought the principles of Augustine into such favor that for many years subsequently to that time they were held by the majority of Protestants. But again the extremes of Augustine's teaching have been supplanted by the older views, until at present it is held principally by the Presbyterian Church and certain branches of other bodies. The largest majority of Christian bodies reject it. Its teachings that all men are guilty of Adam's sin, which their common sense tells them they had no part in committing, that they have no power to choose salvation, and that by the sole sovereign will of God some are elected to salvation while all others are reprobated to damnation are so contradictory to men's sense of justice and the plain statements of Scripture that they can not survive long in the faith of thinking people.

3. **Arminian Theory.**—The Arminian system of theology is so named from Arminius, a Dutch theologian of the latter part of the sixteenth century, who was prominent in dissenting from the strict Calvinism of that period. By Arminianism is not meant particularly the teachings of Arminius, who seems not to have become wholly disentangled from the prevalent Calvinism, but rather that system of theological thought which was represented in a general way by the principles of Arminius. That doctrinal teaching which has come to be called Arminianism during the last four centuries is the common belief of Christians. In its main features it was the prevalent belief prior to Augustine

in the early church; since then it has been held by Roman Catholics, the Anglican Church, Methodism, and is generally held by Christians today. It is the view set forth in preceding pages of this work, and we believe it has there been shown to be the teaching of the Scriptures.

Arminianism teaches that the fall of the race was through man's free choice alone, that as primitive holiness consisted in a tendency, not a determination, to righteousness, so through the fall men have a natural tendency to sin, but that they are in no sense guilty of or punishable for Adam's sin. It is opposed to Calvinism on the notable five points of the Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort: (1) Conditional election, (2) universal redemption, (3) moral freedom, (4) resistibility of grace, and (5) possibility of apostasy. On the question of the effect of Adam's sin on men's power to do good Pelagianism holds their power to do good is unaffected. Semi-Pelagianism says their power to do good is weakened, but not destroyed. Calvinism says through the fall the power to do good is lost and never restored. Arminianism holds that the power to do good was lost through the fall, but that through divine grace it is restored so man can choose to serve God or not.

II. Unscriptural Theories of the Transmission of Original Sin

Of the many theories of the mode of the transmission of depravity the three principal ones are (1) the realistic or theory of Adam's natural headship, (2) the representative or theory of Adam's federal headship, and (3) the parentage or genetic law theory.

Three other theories which have claimed not a few adherents are: (1) the theory of mediate imputation, which holds that guilt is imputed as a consequence of the possession of inherited depravity rather than as is held by the theory of immediate imputation that imputation of guilt for the first sin precedes and is the ground for depravity as a penal infliction; (2) that present depravity is due to sinning of the individual in a previous existence; and (3) that God knew what each individual would have done had he been in Adam's stead in the primitive temptation and therefore imputes guilt to that extent to each individual and imparts a corresponding degree of depravity. This third theory makes the ground of imputation entirely hypothetic and is without any Biblical support.

The first three theories named especially deserve consideration because they have been held so widely. The realistic and representative mode theories should be classed together in that they make depravity a penal retribution. Calvinists are divided between these two theories.

1. **Realistic Theory.**—This is the theory of Adam's natural headship. All men are said to have been in Adam when he sinned; therefore he was the race; when he sinned the race sinned, and both his depravity and guilt attach to the race as well as they did to himself. This view has had special support in this country by W. G. T. Shedd and A. H. Strong. It was also the view of Augustine.

One of its ablest advocates, Dr. Strong, says of this theory, "It holds that God imputes the sin of Adam immediately to all his posterity, in virtue of that organic unity of mankind by which the whole race at the time of Adam's transgression existed, not individually, but seminally in him as its head. The total life of humanity was then in Adam; the race as yet had its being only in him. Its essence was not yet individualized; its forces were not yet distributed; the powers which now exist in separate men were then unified and localized in Adam; Adam's will was yet the will of the species. In Adam's free act, the will of the race revolted from God and the nature of the race corrupted itself. The nature which we now possess is the same nature that corrupted itself in Adam—not the same in kind merely, but the same as flowing to us continuously from him" (Outlines of Systematic Theology, p. 165).

The theory assumes the existence of a generic human nature prior to its existence in individualized forms. This generic nature existed wholly in Adam when he sinned. Therefore when he sinned the generic human nature sinned, and as Adam was condemned for his sin, so the generic human nature shared in his condemnation and became depraved and guilty. As a consequence it is held that as that nature is individualized every person receives the depravity and guilt of Adam's sin and deserves to be punished because of that guilt attaching to his nature. The theory rests on the principle of realism, which assumes that genera are essential existences as distinguished from the individuals representing them. Viewing man's generic nature as an objective reality, it assumes that this nature, which included

both body and spirit, has been divided in some sense, which its advocates can not explain, into all the multiplied millions of human beings that have existed.

The first objection we make to the theory here stated is against the principle of realism itself. Generic human nature has no actual existence apart from individuals. It is merely an abstract mental conception. This is true of genera generally. No plant nature has any actual existence apart from the individuals of the vegetable kingdom. Likewise in the animal kingdom no animal nature exists except in the individual members of the species. A generic animal nature has no reality except in abstract thought. As much may be said of generic human nature. Adam's body can not be shown to have contained the substance of all human bodies. That such a form of matter existed in Adam is only an assumption. Of course it is not claimed to have existed in him in its bulk. Likewise the theory that a generic spiritual nature existed in Adam which has been divided to the individuals of all mankind is but an assumption that can not be proved.

Again we object that there can be no responsible sinning apart from and prior to personal consciousness. Generic human nature, merely as such, could not sin. Only persons sin, and guilt attaches only to persons, who possess intellect, sensibility, and will, which constitute them persons. Adam's guilt was personal because it was the result of personal agency. Without personalization a nature can not sin. But personality belongs to the individual and not to a nature. Therefore until we had individual existence and personal consciousness we could commit no sin and incur no guilt. One knows in his own consciousness that he had no responsibility for the first sin of Adam. His common sense revolts from the idea that he deserves to be punished for that sin of Adam, and he instinctively feels such would be unjust. Even Dr. Strong, one of its ablest supporters, describes the theory as "an hypothesis difficult in itself."

Dr. Shedd attempts to illustrate the possibility of the sharing of the generic nature in Adam's guilt by likening its relation to the soul, to the relation to the murderer himself of the hand that holds the weapon which destroys a life. He assumes that because of the hand's union and oneness with the self-conscious soul it is therefore a coagent of the soul in crime and shares its guilt. This

we deny. It is not a coagent with the soul in sinning, but only an instrument, and therefore not responsible nor capable of guilt. Therefore if, as the illustration is intended to show, generic human nature has guilt in the same sense that the hand which took the forbidden fruit shared the guilt of Adam's soul, then that generic nature was not responsible and it shared no guilt whatever. The weakness of this illustration is a fair example of the weakness of the theory it is used to support.

A still stronger objection is that if we are responsible for the first sin of Adam, we must be likewise responsible for all the other sins he committed before the begetting of his children, through whom we are descended, as well as for the sins of all our ancestors between us and Adam. This theory of the higher realism is such that all attempts by its supporters to deny such a conclusion are in vain. If we had a real existence in Adam as the generic human nature in such a sense that we incurred guilt by that first sin, then no reason can be given why we should not have been equally responsible and guilty for all other sins Adam committed before the individuation of that generic nature. Also the theory holds that each person receives a non-individualized portion of this generic human nature which he transmits by propagation, and which he holds in the same manner as Adam possessed the whole. Therefore that part of generic human nature in one must share in the responsibility and guilt of his personal sinning in such a manner that his descendants will receive with the generic human nature which he transmits to them guilt for his sins as he similarly became guilty for Adam's first sin.

Then as certainly as we are guilty of the first sin of Adam, we are also guilty of every other sin he committed before Seth was born, and also we are guilty of all the sins of all our long line of ancestors back to Adam which they committed before the next member of our ancestry was born. But this is true not merely of a single line of parents and so with each generation the number doubles. Then assuming there was no intermarriage between the lines, five hundred years ago, counting twenty-five years to the generation, each of us had no fewer than a million ancestors living at one time. If we add to this number all those of preceding and subsequent generations the number is incomprehensible. Shall we suppose each of us is guilty of the sum

of all the sins of all of these, doubtless including crimes of every sort—murder, adultery, theft, and every other? What an unthinkable amount of guilt must belong to each of us if this be true! Our individual sins are as nothing in comparison. The theory logically leads to such a conclusion.

But if by generic nature we are responsible and guilty by the sinning in Adam and all other ancestors, then no reason can be shown why we could not have likewise shared in any good works and repentance of Adam and all other ancestors. If one's immediate parents both repented and were pardoned of all their guilt before he was begotten, then is it not reasonable to believe he inherited no guilt? Any theory which logically leads to such conclusions must be fundamentally erroneous.

In addition to the higher realism which assumes that all are guilty of the first sin because partakers of a generic human nature which is said to have had responsibility in the first sin, there is a lower form of realism which affirms that we all had a germinal or seminal existence in Adam when he committed the first sin, and because his will was the will of the race which was then in him all willed that sin and were consequently guilty. According to this theory all men were in Adam in individualized seminal form. All supporters of the theory hold that seminal existence in Adam included the bodies of all men, but some suppose the soul is immediately created and not transmitted by the parents. This theory attempts to show, as does the preceding theory, that all men were so identified with Adam that they are guilty and depraved because of responsibility in his sinning.

The theory is open to objection on most of the points stated in criticism of the higher realism. It fails to show that we had a responsible part in the primitive sin. Also logically it makes us responsible for all of our ancestral sinning and repenting. But this theory is open to another objection peculiar to itself. It implies that all men were guilty in their seminal state before the seminal entities were developed into personal existences. It is held that we were guilty in that seminal state because we sinned in that state. But only a *person* can sin and become guilty. The theory further implies that not only those seminal existences in Adam which have been developed into a personal mode of existence, but also all those seminal existences in him

that never were developed into persons were also guilty and deserving of divine punishment. A theory so unthinkable needs no further refutation.

2. **Representative Theory.**—This is known also as the federal theory and the theory of condemnation by covenant. It was originally set forth by Cocceius in the seventeenth century. It is now held by the Reformed as distinguished from the Lutheran Church. Its ablest advocate in this country was Dr. Charles Hodge.

According to this theory Adam, at the time created, was divinely constituted the representative of the entire human race. It is said that God made a covenant, called a covenant of works, with Adam as representative of the race, by which his primitive probation was the probation of the whole race. Through this federal headship, or legal oneness of the race with Adam, his obedience in the original probation would have resulted in the bestowing of eternal life on all the race, but because of his disobedience God imputes the consequent guilt and depravity, not only to him, but equally to all his descendants.

That the foregoing is a fair representation of the theory is evident from the following statement. "God constituted our first parent the federal head and representative of his race, and placed him on probation, not only for himself, but also for his posterity. Had he retained his integrity, he and all his descendants would have been confirmed in a state of holiness and happiness forever. As he fell from the estate in which he was created, they fell with him in his first transgression, so that the penalty of that sin came upon them as well as upon him. Men therefore stood their probation in Adam. As he sinned, his posterity came into the world in a state of sin and condemnation. They are by nature the children of wrath. The evils which they suffer are not arbitrary impositions, nor simply the natural consequences of his apostasy, but judicial inflictions. The loss of original righteousness, and death spiritual and temporal under which they commence their existence, are the penalty of Adam's first sin" (Hodge, Systematic Theology, Vol. II, p. 196).

All men are guilty of Adam's first sin and deserve punishment, according to the realistic theory, because Adam *was* the whole race at the time it was committed; according to the federal theory, all are likewise guilty and punishable because

Adam *represented* the entire race. The representative theory denies that all men had a share in the commission of the first sin; also that they have any demerit because of it is denied. "When it is said that the sin of Adam is imputed to his posterity, it is not meant that they committed his sin, or were the agents of his act, nor is it meant that they are morally criminal for his transgression" (Hodge, Systematic Theology, Vol. II, p. 195). Only guilt or desert of punishment for the first sin is laid upon all men. This implies the doctrine of imputation which affirms that God imputes the guilt of Adam's sin to us, imputes our guilt to Christ, and imputes Christ's righteousness to us. This imputation of punishment to us is not, then, because we have sinned, but is only because of a legal oneness with Adam for which we were not responsible.

To the representative theory we object, first, that it is without support in the Bible. Even Dr. Hodge himself admits that the statement that God entered into covenant with Adam "does not rest upon any express declaration of the Scriptures." The expression "new covenant" is used, not in contrast with a covenant of works with Adam, but as distinguished from the covenant with Israel at Sinai (Heb. 8:8). Likewise the assumed proofs of a covenant with Adam in Hosea 6:7 is altogether too uncertain to form the ground for an important doctrine. Even if it were evident that God made a covenant with Adam, it would still be necessary for the support of this theory to show that Adam was constituted by God the representative of the race in relation to that covenant. In view of all which the ablest advocates of representativism have set forth in support of it, it is still certain that such a covenant and federal headship has no support in the Bible.

Attempts are made to establish the principle of representativism by reference to the relations between a nation and its ambassador to a foreign nation, an agent and his principal, the ward and the guardian, the child and the parent, and especially by an appeal to the various Scripture statements which represent the evil consequences of sin as passing on from fathers to their children even to the third and fourth generation. Doubtless there is representation in all these instances, and those represented suffer from the wrong course sometimes taken by their representative. Yet who would say the evil consequences

which come upon a child because of his father's drunkenness is a punishment upon the child because he was guilty of the sin his father committed? In none of these examples of representation does the action of the representative involve those represented in either guilt or penalty except as to natural consequences. Therefore these instances have no value in support of this theory, because they are not analogous to the relation it claims exists between Adam and his posterity.

Much dependence is placed in a particular interpretation of Rom. 5:12. Both Dr. Hodge in supporting the representative and Dr. Strong in teaching the realistic theory endeavor at great length to show that this scripture supports his theory, and each is certain it furnishes no ground for the view of the other. This verse has been a theological battleground for centuries. It has been given a variety of interpretations, even by representatives of the same school. Doubtless a text whose meaning is so much in dispute can not of itself properly be made the foundation for a doctrine so fundamental as representativism assumes to be.

We also object to the theory in its assumption that the race had its probation in Adam. There is no support for such an idea in either the Scriptures or reason. It is unreasonable that the moral condition and desert of countless other moral beings should be determined by the choice of one man. We especially object to the theory on the ground that it reflects on the justice of God. It makes God to hold men responsible for the violation of a covenant which they had no part in forming. This assumed covenant is not a covenant, but merely a sovereign decree. The justice of which it makes so much is not justice, but only arbitrary will. It accounts guilty and would punish those who are held to have committed no sin. Until God by judicial act imputes sin to them the race is innocent. Then, according to the theory, God creates sinful souls by making each one with a depraved nature, which depravity is a punishment for that guilt imparted, and is itself sinful and deserving of punishment. This makes God the direct author of sin. Such a theory severely reflects on both the justice and holiness of God.

III. Law of Genetic Transmission

We now come to the consideration of what we conceive to be the true theory of the transmission of original sin. The true

mode must be compatible with the true theory of the nature of original sin. The nature of original sin has already been defined to be a derangement of the moral nature which gives man a tendency to sin. The realistic and representative theories of the transmission of original sin are attempts to explain its transmission in harmony with the Augustinian theory of the nature of original sin.

1. **The Genetic Law.**—Nothing is more certain throughout the entire realm of organic nature than the fundamental law that all living things propagate after their kind. This law was ordained with the original of the first organic forms. "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so" (Gen. 1:11). This law is essential to the orderly preservation of nature. Without it distinct species could not exist. Variations within species are not uncommon, and these variations are sometimes great, yet underlying all these is a general similarity between parent and offspring. Different varieties of horses may differ in color and form, and otherwise, yet as a species they have ever been essentially what they now are with the same anatomical structure and also with the same instincts and disposition.

This law of genesis is so uniform in its operation that it governs the propagation of living orders generally, including man. Not only does the genetic law apply to the propagation of the body after its kind, but intellectual and spiritual qualities are similarly transmitted. Regardless of the question of the origin of the soul, it is certain it is after its kind.

2. **Men Are After Their Kind Morally.**—That moral depravity is the nature of the race at present and that children are born with a depraved nature has been shown. They are begotten after their kind morally. The genetic law also applies to the transmission of depravity. This is not only the most reasonable view, but is implied in the Scriptures. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Psa. 51:5). This statement implies, not only that depravity is native, but that it is through natural generation. In the inquiry "who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" (Job 14:4), the idea is that a defiled vessel makes its contents defiled. So man is defiled morally because of the moral corruption of his parents.

Had Adam continued in holiness, his offspring would have been holy, except for the possible apostasy of individuals who would have become depraved and also possibly their descendants. It is inconceivable that Adam's offspring should have been born depraved if he had remained holy. The transmission of that holiness would have been by the genetic law, and not by any judicial imputation of holiness to his children. Likewise when he sinned and his nature became consequently corrupted, it is altogether reasonable to think depraved nature was transmitted according to the genetic law. It is unreasonable to hold that depravity is inflicted on men as a punishment on the ground of retributive justice. If such were true then it must follow that except for that penal infliction depraved parents would beget holy children, which would be in violation of the universal genetic law. If it be admitted that native depravity is transmitted by the genetic law, then the penal character of depravity is excluded, for if the transmission of depravity is by a law governing the constitution of man, then it can not be a penal infliction for sin.

At this point the question may be asked, Why are children not begotten after the nature of the race as it was originally constituted, rather than after the depraved condition. Transmission of the depraved nature is entirely in harmony with a fundamental law generally recognized by physical science. Biologists have shown that those general characteristics which arise naturally, including those inexplainable mutations and variations caused by climate, environment, etc., are transmissible. Varieties continually being developed within species are the result of this law. But characteristics which are the result of mutilation or which have been otherwise artificially produced are not transmissible. For example, a variety of cattle whose nature is to have no horns will propagate after their kind, but the dehorning of cattle of horned varieties does not result in their offspring being without horns. By sinning, Adam became sinful in nature and thus determined the sinfulness of the race type. The parentage theory of the transmission of depravity is thoroughly in harmony with true science.

This principle of the transmission of acquired characteristics also answers another question frequently asked, Why do the children of sanctified parents have depraved natures? For those

who deny the possibility of entire sanctification in this life the question has no interest. But for others it is important, and is especially so in view of the fact that observation shows the children of the most holy are depraved. The answer is found in the truth that the sanctification of the nature is by grace and not by natural change. The removal of depravity, like the amputation of the horns of cattle, is not a natural change, and the children of fully sanctified parents have the depraved nature according to their kind, much as the offspring of dehorned cattle have horns as do their kind. This non-transmission of holiness received through grace agrees perfectly with the laws of nature as modern science has found them to be.

PART V

SALVATION THROUGH CHRIST, OR SOTERIOLOGY

PART V

SALVATION THROUGH CHRIST, OR SOTERIOLOGY

That division of theology which sets forth the remedy for sin and the application of that remedy in individual experience is commonly called soteriology. This term is derived from two Greek words σώτηρ (*soter*), "savior," and λόγος (*logos*), "discourse," and means the science of salvation. To this part of theology belong most of those truths which are peculiar to Christianity. Under soteriology we deal with the great problems of atonement for sin and salvation from sin.

Chapter I

THE PERSON OF CHRIST

I. The Doctrine and Its Statement

1. **A Vital Doctrine.**—As logical order requires that atonement be considered before salvation, so a study of the atonement must be preceded by inquiry concerning the nature or person of the Atoner. This question of the person of Christ, or Christology, is not one of mere speculative interest, as a certain class of modernists would have us believe, but is vitally important to Christianity. The character of Christians is a consequence of a miraculous divine operation called salvation. But salvation has its basis in atonement, and the value of that atonement is dependent upon the dignity and nature of the Atoner. Therefore what Christ is determines what Christianity is. Herein Christianity is unlike all the great ethnic religions. The character of Mohammedanism or Buddhism is determined wholly by the teachings of their founders regardless of the elements constituting their persons. But Christianity is not so. In both the past and present the religious experience of professed Christians has been generally in harmony with their views relative to the divine-human nature of Christ. In the same measure that Unitarians and modern religious liberalists have denied the deity of Christ, they have denied an objective aspect to the atonement and supernatural conversion. The great Christological contro-

versies of past centuries were a result of men's recognition of the importance of the issues involved.

2. **Elements of the Doctrine.**—The doctrine of the person of Christ, like most other essential truths of Christianity, is not set forth in the Scriptures in scientific and exact form. Such a formulation of the doctrine so far as we have any record did not take place until centuries after the New Testament was written, when the heretical teachings made a definite statement of it necessary. Yet the Christians of the early centuries most surely held the true doctrine of the person of Christ. They held it as they found its various factors in the Scriptures.

The constituent elements in the person of Christ as he is described in the Scriptures are three. (1) He was truly human. So he was known to his apostles and disciples prior to his crucifixion. He had a physical human body, essentially the same as have other men. He was born into the world as a human being, his body grew to maturity, suffered pain and weariness, and later died as other bodies die. He possessed not only a human body, but also a human spirit—a complete human nature. He is said to have "increased in wisdom," which can properly be affirmed only on the ground that he possessed a finite human spirit. (2) Also in addition to a complete human nature, he possessed a complete divine nature. He was truly God. The divine nature in its preexistent form before the incarnation was a person. (3) Yet Christ was one person, not two, though he possessed a complete human and a complete divine nature. This is the doctrine of the person of Christ as revealed in the Scriptures, and as has been commonly held by Christians. Like the doctrine of the Trinity, it is profound, it may not be fully comprehensible, and may contain much of mystery, but it does not therefore follow that it is not true. Christians believe this doctrine because its various elements are clearly taught in the Bible. Belief of the doctrine is the unavoidable consequence of believing the Scriptures. The Bible proofs of it are yet to be shown.

3. **Creedal Statements.**—The truths relative to Christ's person were at first held in a very practical manner with no attempt at a harmony of the various elements by a formulation of the doctrine. But thoughtful minds could not long be satisfied without reconciling the separate facts they held concerning Christ.

The questions must inevitably arise, "Is Christ God or man? If both God and man is he two persons or one? If he has two natures in one person how are they related to each other?" Attempts to answer these questions resulted in various theories, some of which were very objectionable because of giving place to either the human or divine element at the expense of the other. At least six heretical theories of the person of Christ gained prominence before the church came to general agreement on the statement of the doctrine. For a century and a half, or beginning prior to the Council of Nicea and continuing until the Council of Chalcedon, 451 A. D., the church was torn by controversies concerning the person of Christ.

The Nicene statement of faith was concerned principally with the defense of the doctrine of the Trinity. The symbol formulated by the Council of Chalcedon has to do directly with the Christological doctrine. It is the result of the best thought of many good and wise men who in defense of the faith had thought profoundly, and honestly endeavored to represent all the relevant facts of Scripture in proper relation. Even though humanly formulated creeds do not necessarily have divine sanction, yet probably no clearer statement of the doctrine of the person of Christ has been constructed.

It is given in Schaff's Creeds of Christendom as follows: "We, then, following the holy Fathers, all with one consent, teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in manhood; truly God and truly man, of a reasonable (rational) soul and body; consubstantial (coessential) with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and in these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the mother of God, according to the manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, *inconfusedly, unchangeable, indivisibly, inseparably;* the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one person and one subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, and only begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; as

the prophets from the beginning (have declared) concerning him, and the Lord Jesus Christ himself has taught us, and the Creed of the holy Fathers has handed down to us.'' This statement clearly sets forth the different elements of the doctrine and shows their harmony, but no attempt is made to eliminate all mystery from the doctrine.

II. Two Natures in Christ

1. **Complete Human Nature in Christ.**—That Jesus is truly man is shown by his calling himself man and being called man. He is the ''man of sorrows.'' He is ''the man Christ Jesus.'' He most frequently designated himself the ''Son of man.'' This title is given him eighty times in the New Testament.

He had a material body of flesh and blood. ''Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same'' (Heb. 2:14). Jesus himself said, ''A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have'' (Luke 24:39). He was born of the Virgin Mary, and his body grew to maturity as do other human bodies. He was the descendant of Eve, of the seed of Abraham, and the Son of David. He was subject to hunger, thirst, weariness, pleasure, pain, and death. He not only merely ''appeared'' or ''seemed'' to have a physical body, as was held by the Docetæ, certain of the ancient Gnostics who denied the reality of his human body, but he actually had a body.

But Jesus was not human merely in the sense that he had a human body. He also possessed a rational human soul. This is not expressly stated in the Scriptures, but it is often clearly implied and therefore is no less certain. He is said to have ''increased in wisdom,'' which is possible only on the ground that he had a human spirit, for the divine spirit is omniscient. He was also tempted by Satan to ambition and otherwise. God could not be thus tempted, and such temptation had nothing to do with physical desires. He declared himself ignorant of the time of the judgment-day, which can be satisfactorily interpreted only on the ground of his possessing a finite mind. His soul was ''exceeding sorrowful'' (Matt. 26:38), he ''rejoiced in spirit'' (Luke 10:21), ''feared,'' ''groaned,'' and ''wept,'' all of which activities pertain to the human soul rather than to

God. Possessing both a human body and soul, Jesus was truly man complete, yet without sin.

2. **Complete Divine Nature in Christ.**—Jesus is also truly God. This point was proved at length in support of the Trinity. He is called God. Various divine titles are given him. Divine attributes are ascribed to him. Divine works are attributed to him. All things are said to have been created by him. He claimed authority to forgive sins. He was accorded worship, which he accepted. He has ever been God supreme to Christians. He claimed to be one with the Father and equally worthy of honor. Therefore he is deity in the highest and truest sense. He was truly God as well as truly man.

3. **Incarnation of God in Christ.**—The truth of the divine incarnation is further proof of a divine and human nature in Christ. The very idea of divine incarnation is that God has come into the flesh. But flesh in this connection is not to be limited to the material body merely, but includes human nature in its entirety. Such a sense of the term is not uncommon in the Scriptures. In addition to the many proofs of two natures already cited, a number of texts very definitely set forth the truth of the incarnation.

No text is more worthy of citation in proof of the incarnation than is John 1:1-3, 14. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." That the Word is a person is clear from his being God, Creator, and from the use of the personal pronoun of him. That he is truly God in the highest sense is evident from the ascription to him of the attribute of eternity, and all the work of creation. It is said of this divine being that he became flesh, incarnate, by the assumption of human nature; not by the changing of his divine nature into human nature, but by the addition of the one to the other.

Also John opens his first epistle with a statement of the great truth of the divine incarnation. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled,

of the Word of Life; (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us)'' (1 John 1:1, 2). This text is almost equal as proof of the incarnation to that quoted from the fourth Gospel. The Word is described as eternal, therefore as being God, and yet as being *with* the Father, and as being life in his essential nature. He is said to have been manifest in such a sense that he could be known to men by their senses; therefore he was manifested in a material body, yet retaining his divinity so those to whom he was manifested recognized him as that ''eternal life.''

A fuller statement on the subject is Phil. 2:6-9, where of Jesus it is said, ''Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.'' Before Jesus was made in the ''likeness'' of men he was in the form of God. The form of a thing is determined by its nature. He was in the form of God because he was God. Also he was equal with God, implying that in some sense he was related to God. Here Paul sets forth the same truth as does John, that Jesus *was* God and yet *with* God, which implies that there are two who are God. Further it is said this Divine Being was made in the ''likeness'' of men, and had the ''fashion'' of a man. As was said of ''form'' in verse 6, so ''likeness'' and ''fashion'' imply that he was man. They are determined by the nature. Then this text teaches that the Divine Being took upon him human nature.

''God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory'' (1 Tim. 3:16). Regardless of any question as to the correct reading of the first word in the text, whether it be ''God'' or ''he,'' it is certain from the following words that Christ is the one meant. That he was the divine Son of God is clear from many other texts. This text then is a clear declaration that God ''was manifest in the flesh,'' or became incarnate. Other texts in support of divine incarnation are

Rom. 1:2-5; 9:5 and Heb. 2:14. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same."

The foregoing texts teach a divine incarnation; not merely an incarnation of the divine nature, divine attributes, or divine principle, but an incarnation of the personal Son. Not only the Son, but the Father and the Holy Spirit possess the divine nature; yet only the Son is said to have come in the flesh. Only a person could create all things and do and be all that is affirmed of him who is said to have taken human nature. Therefore the personality of Christ, though unique, was not an entirely new one, but that which had ever existed modified by the assumption of human nature.

4. **Mode of the Incarnation.**—According to clear statements of the Scriptures and the common faith of the church the incarnation was effected through conception by the Holy Spirit and the virgin birth. The reality of the virgin birth has been questioned by not a few in recent years. Such questions are raised, not only by avowed infidels, but also by professed Christians who are committed to the modern higher criticism. The objection to the virgin birth seldom stands alone. In almost every instance those who reject it are also unsound concerning the deity of Christ, often denying the divinity of Christ altogether.

The attack is usually made at the point of the virgin birth because it is supposed the evidence for this miracle is more easily disposed of than that for more public miracles such as Jesus' healings or the resurrection. The virgin birth is represented as a legend belonging to an ignorant, uncritical people and as being unworthy of belief in this enlightened age. It is attacked by the same methods the older foes of Christianity have employed against it—insinuation, and by likening it to the coarse Greek and Roman myths of heroes who, it is claimed, were descended from the Gods.

The objection is sometimes made that the virgin birth was not necessary to the incarnation of God. In reply we answer that it can not be shown that it was not necessary. Possibly divine omniscience knew of another method whereby the incarnation could have been effected. But the objection is irrelevant. Even if the virgin birth was not necessary to the divine incarnation, what method of the entrance of the Divine into the flesh

could be more conducive to men's comprehension and belief of it? From this viewpoint the virgin birth is a reasonable method. But the ground for belief in it is the statements of the Scriptures.

The leading statements concerning the virgin birth are found in Matt. 1:18-25 and in Luke 1, 2. Here it is represented, not by brief and obscure allusions, but by detailed descriptions of it, so no question remains as to the sense of the statements of the writers. Matthew affirms of Mary, who was espoused to Joseph, that "before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost" (v. 18). He quotes the angel as saying, "That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost" (v. 20). Then he gives a quotation from Isa. 7:14, "A virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us" (v. 23). "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke 1:35).

Here the doctrine under consideration has sure ground. Those who accept the Scriptures as the inspired Word of God need no more certain evidence. Only persons who question the credibility of the Biblical narrative disbelieve these statements. This is not the proper place to discuss the divine authority and inspiration of the Scriptures. The biological argument is without force to all except those who deny all miracles.

III. Union of Two Natures in One Person

1. **Personal Oneness of Christ.**—By citation of several plain texts of Scripture it has been already shown that both divine and human attributes belong to Christ. But attributes must inhere in a substance or a nature. There can be no extension apart from material substance, nor thought apart from an immaterial being which thinks. The attributes of matter are always connected with material substance, and those of mind with a spiritual nature. Therefore divine and human attributes in Christ must have their basis in a real existence of both a divine and a human nature in Christ. And by these two natures is meant divine and human substances, not mere manifestations of divine and human operations. Christ had two natures in the

sense that he possessed two sets of attributes or qualities—the human and the divine.

But two natures do not necessarily require two persons. Christ was one person combining two distinct natures in personal oneness by a unique and mysterious bond. Such is clearly stated in the ancient church symbols and has ever been the common belief of Christians. Oneness of personality of Christ is implied in the Scriptures. In all his sayings there is not a single hint that he was two persons, but he ever spoke of himself as a single person. Between persons of the Trinity the different divine personalities are indicated by the use of such pronouns as I, thou, and he, but between the divine and human natures of Christ no such thing is recorded. In all his conduct and as he was known to those most intimately associated with him he appears as one person. Further Scriptural evidence of personal oneness will appear later in showing that the powers and attributes belonging to both natures are ascribed to the one Christ.

Like the doctrine of the Trinity, the idea of personal oneness of the two natures is a great mystery. It is probably even more difficult for thought than is the idea of three persons in one substance. But as that profound truth is believed because of a sure ground in divine revelation, so it is reasonable to believe the truth of Christ's personal oneness. It is natural and not improper to seek an explanation of the problem of Christology—to show how he can be truly God and truly man and yet but one person. It may be a question to what extent such an explanation is possible to theological science because of the limitations of human knowledge. But it is comforting to know full comprehension of the subject is not essential to one's enjoying the benefits of Christ's atoning work. Devout contemplation need not wait to appreciate the fact of the divine incarnation until speculative thought has solved all mystery in relation to the subject. To do so would be as unreasonable as to refuse to eat food until full understanding is attained of the mode by which the body assimilates its food.

Even if the mystery of Christ's nature is inscrutable, it is at least important to show that it involves no impossibility or self-contradiction. Because the person of Christ is unique, nothing in human experience is analogous to the union of the two natures in him. Dr. Charles Hodge has illustrated it by the union

of the physical and spiritual natures of man in a single personality. But the illustration is not parallel in that the physical nature alone possesses no personality as does both the human and divine natures which became one person in Christ. Yet the illustration has much value in showing that the union of man's soul and body in one person, which is a certain fact of consciousness, is also an insoluble mystery. We are conscious of possessing a material body having the various common properties of matter, and also a spirit which is entirely different in substance from matter, with none of its properties, but with qualities of an entirely different kind. We are aware through consciousness that we are one person—that the body and spirit are united, but the nature of that union is incomprehensible to us. In view of a fact of consciousness so familiar yet so mysterious, it is not unreasonable to believe on the authority of divine revelation that very God and very man might be constituted one person in Christ.

2. **Christ Is God-Man.**—In some sense according to the Scriptures Christ is two, in another sense he is one. As to nature he is two, as to personality one. He possesses a complete divine nature and a complete human nature; as to nature he is God and man, but as to person he is but one—God-man. He is theanthropic in personality, but not in nature. This is clearly set forth in the Scriptures and is so held by Christians in general. Both divine and human attributes appear in the life of Christ, and as already stated these two sets of attributes have their basis in two distinct natures. The personal oneness of Christ involves no mingling of these two natures. They ever remain distinct. Copper and zinc combined constitute a third metal, brass. But the divine and human natures in Christ do not constitute a divine-human, or theanthropic nature. Neither is there a transference of divine attributes to the human, nor of human attributes to the divine. Attributes are characteristics of the nature, and to transfer divine attributes to human nature would be to make it divine. Attributes are not transferable. The characteristics of body and spirit are not transferable. Spiritual matter would be self-contradictory. There is a communion of divine and human attributes in the person of Christ, but no communication of attributes of one nature to the other.

Christ is one, or theanthropic, only in personality, but in

this sense he is really one. The divine nature does not dwell in Christ as the Spirit of God dwells in his people. Such a union would constitute no personal oneness. The personal oneness of the divine and human natures is as real as that of the physical and spiritual natures in men. Personality belonged to the divine nature of Christ prior to the incarnation, but his human nature had no existence and certainly no distinct personality of its own at any time. Yet when the logos became incarnate the personality of the second person of the Trinity must have been modified by its union with human nature. Christ possessed both divine and human facts of consciousness, yet he was one person. This union of the divine and human natures in one person in Christ was necessary to the atonement. Without it his suffering and death must have been that of a mere man. But with a theanthropic personality suffering for man's sin, a dignity is given to the offering for sin that is equal to every demand.

3. **Effect of Personal Union of Two Natures.**—As a consequence of a human and a divine nature united in one person the Scriptures affirm attributes and refer acts of the divine nature to Christ as human, of the human nature to Christ as divine, and of either the divine or human natures to the theanthropic person of Christ. So of man it may be truly said that he is both mortal and immortal, material and spiritual, of the dust of the earth and a child of God.

When Jesus said, "Before Abraham was I am," he affirmed of his person, including human nature, what was true only of his divine nature. A similar declaration is, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." His coming down from heaven is true only of his divinity, yet it is affirmed of him as "man." On the other hand, many facts are predicated of his person as divine which are true only of his human nature. "The Church of God which he purchased with his own blood." Here the blood by which the church is purchased is designated the blood of God. Yet Jesus' body belonged to his human nature. They "crucified the Lord of glory." It was the body of Jesus that was nailed to the cross, yet it is here affirmed the Lord of glory, the divine being, was crucified. Likewise because the person born of Mary was the "Son of God," therefore she may

properly be called the "mother of God," as Jesus' blood is called the blood of God. And as God is said to have been born, so it is true that "God died." Such facts are possible only on the ground of Christ's theanthropic personality. A failure to recognize in him a single theanthropic personality results in the Bible appearing to be filled with inexplainable paradoxes.

IV. Criticism of Christological Errors

A review and criticism of the different ancient and modern heretical doctrines concerning the person of Christ is helpful to a clear understanding of the true doctrine. The true doctrine has been stated. What is now to be said will show in a measure what is not the true doctrine. Only the outstanding ancient errors are described together with what are considered the most important modern errors.

1. **The Ebionites.**—Ebionism has been described as "Judaism within the pale of the Christian church." The Ebionites regarded Christ as the promised Messiah, but because the idea of Christ's divinity appeared to them incompatible with the truth of the oneness of God so strongly affirmed in the Old Testament, they denied his divinity and held that he was a mere man. Some of them allowed his virgin birth, while others denied it. They held plain humanitarianism of Christ. Because it denied that Christ was truly God incarnate it was wrong.

2. **The Gnostics.**—Gnosticism was pagan philosophy introduced into the church. Its error was the opposite of Ebionism in that it denied that Christ had a physical body. It held that matter was not created by God, but had another origin and is essentially evil. Therefore, Gnostics reasoned, the holy Christ could not possess a body of this intrinsically evil matter. Many of them regarded his appearing to have a body as an illusion, and were consequently called Docetæ, which means to appear, to seem to be. Others explained away his humanity in other ways. The apostle John in both his Gospel and first epistle opposes this heresy, which was already finding a place among Christians, by his many declarations of Christ's incarnation. "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist" (1 John 4:3). Gnosticism was also objectionable in its denial to Christ of real divinity. He was regarded as an emanation from God and therefore inferior to God.

3. **The Arians.**—The doctrinal error of Arius was especially in respect to the person of Christ. By mistaking the temporary subordination of the Son to the Father for a permanent inequality he took the unscriptural position that Christ is not very God consubstantial with the Father, but that there was a time when he did not exist and therefore lacked the divine attribute of eternity. He was regarded as having been created, yet the highest and first of all created beings. Arianism held that he was *like* God, as opposed to the Biblical teaching that he *is* God. Because of this it was rejected by the church.

4. **The Apollinarians.**—As Arianism denied the integrity of the divine nature in Christ, and as Gnosticism rejected the reality of his human nature, Apollinarianism denied the integrity of his human nature by declaring he had no rational human mind, but only the divine spirit. It was an attempt to avoid the difficulties of two complete natures being united in one person. It was based on the trichotomic theory that man's constitution has three elements—the physical body, the rational mind or spirit, and an intermediate element, the animal soul, which was supposed to be the seat of the sensuous nature. Apollinarianism held that Christ had a human body and animal soul, but no human spirit, and that the divine logos supplied the place of the human mind. It allowed to Christ only the lower part of human nature, so he was not truly man. We object to Apollinarianism, first because trichotomy, its necessary basis, is an unprovable theory, as was shown in preceding pages. But the disproof of Apollinarianism is in its failure to account for the many facts in Jesus' life that are explainable only on the ground that he had a human spirit; for example, he was tempted in all points like as we are.

5. **The Nestorians.**—While Apollinarianism sacrificed the integrity of the human nature of Christ to make sure of his oneness, Nestorianism on the other hand sacrificed his oneness in the interests of the integrity of the two natures. It held that the logos inhabited or dwelt in the human nature somewhat as is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. It claimed to hold personal oneness of Christ, but its various explanations of the relationship of the divine and human amounted to a rejection of that oneness. Nestorians would not attribute to the one person of Christ, which they professed to allow, the attributes of each

nature. They rejected the Scripture statement concerning the blood of God (Acts 20:28). Such a position really amounted to a denial of one person in Christ.

6. **The Eutychians.**—This error is the opposite of the Nestorian, and was supported by the opposers of the latter. The Eutychians virtually denied that Christ possessed two natures. They admitted that before the incarnation there were two natures, but held that these two natures were mingled so a third nature was formed, whether the divine became humanized or the human deified. But they commonly illustrated the method of unification as the human nature being like a drop of vinegar cast into the ocean; as it is lost in the ocean, so was the human nature of Christ lost in his divine nature. Therefore the theory admitted but one nature in Christ, or was monophysitic. It was in this respect practically identical with Docetism, and as surely fails to account for the many human facts in the person and life of Christ as described in the Bible.

7. **The Lutheran Theory.**—The Lutheran Christology holds all that is set forth on the subject in the ancient church symbols, but in addition it holds that the human nature of Christ became possessed of divine attributes as a result of its being united with the divine nature in one person. Certainly the Bible teaches that whatever may be affirmed of either nature may be affirmed of the *person* of Christ, but the Lutheran theory claims that whatever attributes may be affirmed of one nature may also be affirmed of the other *nature*. It especially holds that the human nature has the divine attributes, particularly omnipresence. Though this theory has been held in a variety of forms among them, and as to its exact statement has been a matter of great internal controversy, yet it has been tenaciously held from the time of Luther to the present.

This theory of the omnipresence of the body of Christ is important to the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation—the doctrine that the real body and blood of Christ are present in the elements of the Lord's Supper. The ascription of omnipresence to the body of Christ was demanded for consistency by their strong emphasis of the consubstantiation theory. In spite of the fact that Lutherans deny that their Christology was determined by their theory of the eucharist, others have generally believed it was so determined.

In objection to the Lutheran theory of the person of Christ it may be said, first, that the fact that Lutheranism was from its beginning committed to consubstantiation is reason for doubt that its Christology was not made to conform to that theory of the eucharist. A second objection is that it is inconsistent. Though it affirms a communication of attributes between the divine and human natures and holds that the human received the divine attribute of omnipresence, yet it denies that the divine nature was affected by or received anything from the human nature. In this it is one-sided. A third objection is the absence of any Scriptural support for the theory. What is true of either nature is regarded by the Scriptures as true of his person, but no text can fairly be interpreted to teach that what is true of one nature is true of the other nature. A fourth objection is that the Bible teaches that Christ was truly human, and the Lutheran idea that the divine attributes in Christ's nature were hidden is a mere assumption in favor of the theory. A last objection to the Lutheran Christology is that it is impossible to separate attributes from the substance in which they inhere. Attributes are not transferable. Besides if the human becomes omnipresent, then the finite becomes infinite, which is a contradiction in terms.

8. **The Socinian Theory.**—The Socinian Christology as at first held was purely humanitarian and therefore practically identical with the ancient Ebionism. It held Christ was a mere man as to his essential nature. Yet he was regarded as having a miraculous conception, as being sinless, as having been especially endowed by the Holy Spirit, and as having been temporarily taken up to heaven prior to the beginning of his ministry. Much, if not all, of the supernatural originally affirmed of Christ by Socinians is denied by those who are at present known as Socinians. A mere statement of this theory is sufficient disproof of it in view of what has been said in previous pages, and even for the casual reader of the Scriptures.

9. **The Kenotic Theory.**—In its general aspects this theory is the opposite of the Lutheran. It is so called from the Greek *kenosis,* a form of which is found in Phil. 2:7. There Christ is said to have emptied himself (see A. S. V.) in becoming incarnate. This Christology assumes the Logos emptied himself of his divine attributes or limited them to the measure of the

human. In doing so he ceased to be omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent. The theory has been held in varying forms by leading advocates. It endangers the doctrine of a human and divine nature united in one person. Further objections are that though it professes to have its basis in Scripture, it fails to substantiate that claim by any proper interpretations. The text most relied upon, Phil. 2:7, does not state that Christ emptied himself of divine attributes. The context implies that he emptied himself of the divine glory and exalted station he held before the incarnation. But another difficulty for the theory is to show how he could empty himself of divine attributes without ceasing to be divine. It has been previously shown that attributes always inhere in a substance or a nature and can not exist apart from it. Therefore to give up divine attributes in favor of human characteristics is impossible without a transmutation of the divine Logos into humanity. But this leads to another difficulty, for God is immutable. Also if Christ ceased to be divine the divine Trinity ceased to exist. Again if Christ possessed no truly divine nature his atonement could not be regarded as of infinite efficacy. For these and other reasons the kenotic theory is unworthy of acceptance.

Chapter II

RECONCILIATION THROUGH CHRIST

I. Preliminary Questions

1. **Offices of Christ.**—As the Savior of men, Christ is described in the Scriptures as king, prophet, and priest. So he is represented in Old Testament predictions of his Messianic character and work. Among the people of Israel the kingly, prophetical, and priestly were distinct offices usually held by different individuals. In Christ they are all three combined. Yet they represent distinct aspects of his redemptive work and are real offices.

Our Lord was truly king even during his earthly life, but especially is he now king. He sits on David's throne in the sense that he rules over God's people. In this aspect he saves men by his beneficent rule, by his greatness, power, majesty, and supremeness. He is the deliverer and protector of his people. He is prophet, not in the sense of predictor of future events merely, but in the broader sense of the term as revealer of the will of God to man. He is prophet in the same sense that he is the divine Logos. He spoke as one having authority. The word of the Lord came to the Old Testament prophets, but Jesus was himself the "Word." He performs the important function of revealing to men the character of God and the way of salvation. But this aspect of Christ's redemptive work must not be emphasized to the exclusion of the priestly, as has been done by Socinians. Whatever may be our need of instruction, we need more than instruction.

In his priestly office Christ appears as atoner. In this character he makes satisfaction for sin by propitiating God through sacrificial suffering. He becomes a mediator between God and man, an intercessor or an advocate. Christ is the true priest. Melchisedek and Aaron were but types of him. He alone has provided an effectual covering for sin.

2. **Sense of Reconciliation.**—In theological usage reconciliation may be defined as a bringing of God and man into union, and is synonymous with atonement. The word rendered "atonement" in Rom. 5:11 by the common version is in the American Revised Version rendered "reconciliation." Of the two words, "atonement" is the more commonly used in theology. The

English word "atonement" is derived from the phrase "at one" and therefore signifies harmony of relationship. But while its etymological sense is not out of harmony with its theological meaning, yet we must look elsewhere for an adequate definition of it. Broadly, atonement means "any satisfaction, amends, reparation, or expiation made for wrong or injury; something suffered, done, or given by way of propitiation or equivalent." Definitions of the atonement of Christ vary according to the particular "theory" of the atonement that is held. A complete definition of the atonement would amount to a full statement of the doctrine. But for our present purpose it may be defined as the expiation of sin and the propitiation of God by the vicarious sufferings of Christ, on the ground of which God can pardon sin in full consistency with his personal holiness and the dignity of his just law.

3. **The Fact of Atonement and the Doctrine.**—It is not the doctrine of the death of Christ that saves men, but the death itself. The atonement was made long before men attempted to formulate the doctrines concerning it. Very many devout Christians who have never attempted a formulation of the doctrine have trusted in the great truth of Christ's atonement to the saving of their souls. Therefore a clear distinction exists between the fact of atonement and all theories of its nature. Christians generally believe Christ made reconciliation for sin, because the Bible definitely affirms it. The Bible also provides the elements from which a construction of the doctrine has been attempted. But no theory thus constructed has ever gained general acceptance. The important thing then is the *fact* that reconciliation has been made, and the thing of next importance is that men exercise a saving faith in that fact. So far there is no cause for any doubt or difference of views.

But as to why atonement is necessary to salvation and how the death of Christ saves, many theories have been set forth. One author enumerates fifteen theories that have come into more or less prominence. The much controversy of the past has tended to repel some at the present time from the study of the subject. In recent years there has come a disposition with some to despair of the possibility of arriving at a certain knowledge of the doctrine of the atonement of Christ. "The excuse for such despair lies in the bewildering variety of explanations

that have been given, and the apparently successful criticism of most of them by the advocates of the rest. That appearance is partially deceptive. Those who look carefully into the leading accounts will find that they are complementary one to another, that each represents a real aspect of the whole, and that they are mutually exclusive chiefly because of their exaggeration of the aspects which they represent'' (J. S. Lidgett, The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement, P. 5).

Probably a truth so profound as that of the atonement may not be perfectly understood by finite minds, yet in view of all the Scriptures state on the subject it is reasonable to believe a doctrine of the atonement is possible. Evidently a rationale of the atonement is not possible by mere speculation apart from the revelation of the truth concerning it in the Bible. We are dependent upon the Scriptures for the elements from which the true doctrine must be constructed. These elements include, not only the direct statements of inspiration, but also all truths learned by sound reasoning from those truths and by sound reasoning from other doctrines which have their basis in the statements of the Scriptures. Man's mind is so constituted that it has an inevitable tendency to seek for the philosophy of things. There is no legitimate objection to attempting to show how the cross saves. It is unreasonable to assume that because full knowledge of the subject is impossible we must therefore be content with no understanding of it.

The doctrine of the atonement is important. Like other fundamental doctrines of Christianity, it is important for the determining of other doctrines as they also are determinative of it. The constitution of the mind is such that it requires consistency and can not rest in holding as truth ideas that are contradictory or mutually exclusive. However incomplete may be one's theory of the atonement, it is important that one do not hold a theory that is fundamentally wrong. To do so will usually lead to unsoundness in one's doctrine of salvation, as is shown by history. The Socinian theory of the atonement is determined by its theory of sin and of the person of Christ. Likewise its theory of salvation is such as is required by its doctrine of atonement. No other theory of salvation is logically permissible to the other doctrines of the system. Also the Calvinistic system with its particular theory of sin and depravity

holds a limited atonement and affirms that Christ suffered the exact amount that all the elect should suffer for their sins, which insures their salvation. Consequently their theory of salvation by election must logically follow. As one doctrine logically determines another in any system, so in the true system each doctrine must be interpreted or constructed in harmony with all of the others, and all must be in harmony with the Scriptures.

II. Theories of Salvation Without a Reconciliation

Before setting forth the Christian doctrine of reconciliation it is well that we first take some notice of those theories which either deny the necessity of atonement for effecting salvation or deny the possibility of pardon on any ground. To show the falsity of these theories is to show that atonement is necessary to salvation.

1. **Impossibility of Pardon.**—This theory denies salvation in any real sense. It affirms that forgiveness of sin is impossible in a perfect government. The executive of a human government may properly remit the penalty because of the fact that human legislators may make unjust laws, judges may misapply the laws, juries may misunderstand the evidence, witnesses may intentionally or ignorantly misrepresent the facts, or the violation of the law may have been due to excusable ignorance. But it is reasoned that in the divine government the laws are absolutely just, rightly applied, and penalty is according to absolute justice; therefore it can not under any circumstances be remitted. The theory further declares that when penalty has been suffered, then will follow endless blessedness. It is the theory of universalism.

But the Bible teaches that God will pardon the sinner and save him from penalty. The future blessedness it offers is through salvation from penalty by the atonement. Those who teach blessedness after penalty regard sin lightly and its penalty as trifling. They assume that much of the suffering for sin is in this life and that even for greater sins it continues but for a comparatively short time in the next life. Such a view is opposed to the convictions of those whose moral judgments are most worthy of consideration, and also to the plain teachings of Scripture that the penalty for sin is everlasting. In Matt. 25: 46 it is said, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." In the original of

this text the same word that measures the duration of the punishment of the wicked describes also the duration of the happiness of the righteous. With this view blessedness after penalty is excluded. But the Scriptures teach and men intuitively feel that there is mercy and pardon in God.

2. **Forgiveness by Divine Prerogative.**—This theory reasons that God is an absolute sovereign, therefore can pardon sin if he wills, and that because he is kindly disposed he will if he can. Therefore it is assumed that there is no bar to pardon and consequently that God freely pardons all sin on these grounds. This theory is the opposite of the one previously reviewed. But the assumption of such universal pardon is opposed to the facts of history, to experience, and to the plain statements of the Bible. The casual observer knows that sin is punished now in this life in his own experience and in that of others. The history of mankind is replete with examples of penalty inflicted, which is sure evidence that sin is not pardoned freely. If God could pardon by prerogative and were disposed to do so, as is affirmed, then why these innumerable examples of infliction of penalty? The Bible record abounds with examples of punishment for sin and warnings against it. The theory under review makes these meaningless.

The ability to pardon sin is not a question of sovereignty. It is not irreverent to say God can not do some things. God can not lie. He is limited by his perfections. He can not change his essential nature. He can not do evil, because he is perfectly good. He can not pardon the impenitent sinner except by atonement without gross violation of his holiness. That attribute of holiness in him which excludes all evil from him can no more approve evil in other moral creatures. Likewise such sovereign forgiveness without atonement would be subversive of the divine government. God has given just laws and has threatened penalty for their violation. A law without a penalty for its violation is useless. But if a penalty be not inflicted on the offender or if other measures be not taken to preserve the dignity of the law the government ceases to exist and the ruler is despised by his subjects. If it be said that some offenders might be thus pardoned while others are punished to preserve respect for government, we object that no such practise is possible in the impartial government of a good God. If pardon is so

granted it must be universal. But such a course would mean that government would virtually cease to exist, and that for all practical ends obedience and sin would have no distinction.

3. **Pardon or Repentance.**—Repentance is especially urged as a sufficient ground for pardon; therefore atonement is not needed. It is reasoned that when one commits an offense against his fellow men and then comes to the offended in repentance, confessing his sin and humbly asking pardon, they forgive him because of the evidence of sincere repentance. Surely, it is said, God, whose love is much greater, will forgive those who sincerely repent of their sins against him. Doubtless repentance is an important ground for forgiveness, and is clearly taught as such in the Scriptures. But the question is, is it the only necessary condition for pardon? Between man and man it, with proper adjustments as to injury done, is ordinarily the only condition necessary. But the relation between the sinner and God is not parallel to that between man and man. God is moral ruler. It is not merely an adjustment of personal feelings with God in relation to the sinner, but his personal holiness and good law must be vindicated. The purpose of the infliction of penalty is to accomplish this. In addition to repentance, the ends of penalty must be achieved.

Also divine pardon of sin is not possible on the ground of repentance alone, because naturally man can not truly repent of sin. This is due to the depravity of his nature which constitutes him naturally selfish and rebellious toward God. Only as godly sorrow is wrought in the heart of the sinner by the gracious working of the Spirit, which working is itself granted only through the atonement, can he truly repent. This gracious operation in effecting godly sorrow is not independent of the will of the sinner, but is by God's mercy through Christ. Any repentance that involves no sincere sorrow because a good and kind Creator has been unjustly treated and grieved, but has its basis only in selfish advantage and fear of punishment, is itself sinful and no proper ground for pardon. Every sinner will sooner or later repent of his sinning in this sense when he comes to suffer penalty. If pardon were proper on such grounds, then all would repent, all penalty would be remitted, and the holiness of God and of his good law would be despised.

III. Biblical Statements Concerning the Atonement

In the formulation of any Christian doctrine exegesis should always precede doctrinal construction. For the devout believer in the Bible as divine revelation there is no appeal from its statements. Doctrine must accord with its statements; therefore they must first be known. It is especially important to examine the Biblical teaching concerning the atonement before attempting a rationale of it, because of the many conflicting theories, all claiming the support of Scripture, and the disposition on the part of not a few persons to doubt the possibility of our understanding its nature. But in the Bible we can be assured of certain knowledge on the subject. If all points of inquiry are not made clear there, we are sure that what is stated is true.

Here our task consists in careful exegesis. It is important, however, that we do not single out particular texts, but exhibit the teachings of the Bible as a whole, that no important texts be left out of view which would modify or invalidate a conclusion drawn from other texts. For brevity we choose to classify the texts cited according to subject rather than to examine them in their order in the canon or as they appear in the different authors or books of the Bible.

1. **Christ Died for the Salvation of Men.**—That the sufferings, humiliation, and death of Christ are vitally connected with the pardon of men's sins is a truth so frequently stated in the Scriptures that its mention seems almost superfluous. This was the burden of the message of Jesus and the apostolic ministry. It is the central thought of the sacred writings. This must be evident even to the superficial reader. No exhaustive citation of texts on this subject is possible in the limits of this work, but a few will serve as examples for our purpose. "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28). "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3:14, 15). "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8). "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man" (Heb. 2:9). "For if

the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?'' (Heb. 9:13, 14). ''So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many'' (v. 28). ''Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood'' (Rev. 1:5).

In view of the vast multitude of clear declarations of the Scriptures such as the foregoing, all who pretend to believe them necessarily admit there is a connection between Christ's death and our salvation. But some limit that connection to such a degree as to misrepresent the true teaching of divine Revelation. The Arians, the Socinians, and the modern religious liberals are among those who hold unsatisfactory theories of how the death of Christ saves. Socinianism gives much prominence to the point that Christ is a teacher, and that as such he saves his people by instructing them concerning the will of God so they may escape a life of sin and its consequence, and be caused to live a life of holiness. But it is affirmed that he must be divinely shown to be a teacher from God and that his resurrection from the dead was chosen as the means of authentication. Therefore, it is reasoned, his death was an indispensable antecedent to his resurrection and in this sense he saves men through his death.

Also it is said his death is a means of our salvation in that by dying as a martyr in defense of his teaching he gave the strongest testimony possible to the veracity and his belief of that teaching. Again, Socinians say Jesus by his death gave a wonderful example of loyalty to truth. But they affirm the principal value of Jesus' death was in its manifestation of his love for men which constrains them to love God in return, to forsake sin, and to live righteously.

Doubtless Christ is a divinely sent teacher of whom the voice of God from heaven said, ''Hear ye him,'' and his death and resurrection do prove him to be such. Moreover, all else that Socinians affirm as to the value of his death as a witness, as an example of loyalty, and as constraining men to love God is true and Scriptural; but this is not the whole truth, nor are any of these the chief sense in which the death of Christ saves

us. Some of the Scriptures cited state that we are saved by his blood. "He hath loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood." These texts state that in some more special sense than those described we are saved by the blood of Christ. A criminal under sentence of death needs more than teaching as to what is required by the law. Such might have been sufficient before he became a criminal. He needs more than evidence that the instruction given him is credible. He needs more than an example of faithfulness or a manifestation of loving interest. He is guilty and needs pardon. His only salvation is a remission of his penalty, and that can properly be remitted only when the righteousness of the law can be otherwise supported. Unless he is first pardoned all instruction is useless. The death of Christ is that ground on which God may properly order non-execution of penalty on the sinner.

2. **Christ Died in Our Stead.**—The Scriptures represent Christ as having died as a substitute for us. His death was vicarious. Had he not died we must have died. "The Son of man came . . . to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28). "While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8). "Who gave himself a ransom for all" (1 Tim. 2:6). Jesus was made a little lower than the angels "that he . . . should taste death for every man" (Heb. 2:9). "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust" (1 Pet. 3:18).

It is sometimes said that these texts do not necessarily teach that the death of Christ was vicarious, but may mean merely that he died in our behalf and not in our stead, much as a soldier dies for the benefit of his countrymen but not in the place of them. Such is the theory of Socinians, as has been already shown. They deny that Christ died as our substitute, as do also Arians. Arianism claims Christ's death has value for our salvation principally in making him influential with God as intercessor for us. It holds that because of Christ's sacrifice in becoming incarnate, foregoing divine glory, and suffering and dying because of his love for men, God was well pleased with him and consequently grants his petitions for pardon of man's sins as he would not otherwise do. Whatever element of truth this theory may contain, it evidently is defective in omitting a very important element.

In opposition to the idea of Christ's death being vicarious

it is said the word "for" in the texts before quoted, including the Greek prepositions from which it is translated, ἀντί (*anti*) in the first text and ὑπέρ (*huper*) in the others, mean only on behalf of, on account of, or for the benefit of us. That these terms are in some instances so used is readily admitted, as in the statement "Christ died for our sins." Evidently he did not die instead of our sins. But while this is true it is also true that "for" and the equivalent Greek terms mentioned may also mean instead of. And with proof that in some of the foregoing texts these terms must be so understood we have good ground for always so understanding them when used of the death of Christ in relation to us. For proof that the Greek prepositions ἀντί (*anti*) and ὑπέρ (*huper*) sometimes express the idea of instead, the highest lexicographical authorities might be given, but more direct proof is possible. That the words "Christ died *for us*" mean in our stead is evident from the context, which says, "For scarcely *for* a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die." But who could believe one would sacrifice his life for any mere benefit to a good man? Doubtless one would die for a good man only for the purpose of redeeming the good man's life, which otherwise must be lost.

When Caiaphas said, "It is expedient for us, that one man should die [ὑπέρ, huper] *for* the people, and that the whole nation *perish* not" (John 11:50), he certainly meant that either Christ or the nation must *perish* and that Christ should die in its stead. Inspiration tells us that this was a prophecy that Christ should die *for,* instead of, the Jewish people. The word ἀντί (*anti*) translated "for" in Matt. 20:28 is used in the sense of substitution. "If he ask a fish, will he [ἀντί, *anti*] for a fish," instead of a fish, "give him a serpent?" (Luke 11:11). Christ died for our sins, "the just for the unjust," in the sense that if he had not died for our sins we must have died. "The wages of sin is death." Man had sinned and was under sentence of death. But Christ died in his place so that in some sense it may properly be said his death was a substitute for that of man.

But it is objected by some that whether the death of Christ be regarded as a substituted penalty or a substitute for a penalty it is unjust and not admissible that the innocent should suffer vicariously for the guilty. Doubtless this is true if that suffer-

ing by the substitute were compulsory. Such would certainly be unjust. But if he voluntarily suffers for the guilty and the guilty is pardoned only on repentance and after giving evidence that the crime will not again be committed, then no valid evidence can be made against such vicarious suffering. If Christ be pleased to suffer for men as a means of supporting the divine holiness and law while God pardons the sinner after the interests of these have been properly protected, no reason is evident why he may not so suffer.

3. **Christ Died to Propitiate God.**—To propitiate is to appease, or to turn away the wrath of an offended person. It implies two parties at variance—one the offender and the other the offended. A propitiation is that which makes the aggrieved party favorable to the offender. It is a reconciliation, an atonement, or an expiation. These words are synonymous in meaning. In the present consideration man is the offender, God is the offended one, and the blood of Christ is the propitiation. All texts that teach the death of Christ is for expiation, atonement, or reconciliation, teach that it is propitiatory.

This truth is declared by many texts. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood" (Rom. 3:25). "He is the propitiation for our sins" (1 John 2:2). "God . . . sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 John 4:10). "We also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation" (Rom. 5:11, A. S. V.). "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 5:18). The Greek words which are translated "propitiation" and synonymous terms are used, not only by the Septuagint and the New Testament, but by classical Greek writers to express the action of a person who turns aside the wrath of a deity. God is the one propitiated, not men.

But all those who deny an objective in the atonement, including all Socinians, make the reconciliation to refer wholly to man. They affirm that inasmuch as God is always in the right, it is not conceivable that anything that might be done can change him. Therefore, it is said, man must be the one who is reconciled to God by his being influenced to love and obey God. Such a view is assumed to have support in the words of Paul already quoted, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto

himself'' (2 Cor. 5:19). It is held that Jesus' only work in the world was that of persuading men to piety, and in no sense to propitiate God. But the context is a refutation of this Socinian theory, for there it is clearly implied that Christ's work of reconciliation was accomplished, and so also is the committing of the word of reconciliation to the apostles accomplished. After all this the Apostle exhorts men to be reconciled to God. In other words, they are exhorted to avail themselves of that reconciliation that Christ has effected with God. According to the Bible, this they are to do by faith in Christ, whom God 'hath made to be sin [a sin-offering] for us, who knew no sin; that we might be the righteousness of God in him' (v. 21). Without such a sin-offering God must impute the sins of men unto them. By it he might properly forgive their sins, because by it the bar to pardon was removed.

That the expression ''be ye reconciled to God'' implies in Bible usage the idea of making satisfaction to the offended party or accepting a satisfaction so made, is evident from other texts. Of David it is said, ''Wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his master? should it not be with the heads of these men?'' (1 Sam. 29:4). Here Saul was displeased with David and therefore was the one to be propitiated or reconciled to David. But David is said to reconcile himself to Saul. ''If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift'' (Matt. 5:23, 24). Here the offerer is the offender and his brother is the offended one and needs to be propitiated or reconciled. But the offender is exhorted to be reconciled to the offended. In both of these texts and especially in the latter we have an exhortation exactly parallel with that in 2 Cor. 5:19. Therefore Paul's statement must be understood as meaning what that of Jesus certainly means. It must mean that God is the one propitiated or reconciled and we are to avail ourselves of his favor.

Another Socinian objection to the doctrine that the death of Christ is to propitiate God is that God is not an implacable and vengeful being who will be disposed to show mercy only when displeasure is satisfied by the death and sufferings of his own Son. The objector in describing the orthodox view as

representing God as passionately revengeful greatly misrepresents that view. Those who teach that Christ reconciles God to men do not so think of God, but regard him as a God of love. Because of his love he gave his Son to die for men's salvation. We agree with Socinians that God is love, but we also believe and the Scriptures teach that he has other attributes—holiness and justice, and divine holiness must be regarded. God is moral ruler and it is important that his law be protected if the sinner is to be pardoned. The "wrath of God" abides on the sinner in the sense that God is displeased with his sinning and as moral ruler has the responsibility of inflicting the penalty of his law upon violators of it. In order to bring about the non-execution of the just penalty of the law on the sinner, proper satisfaction must be made in vindication of the divine law and holiness. This is the sense in which the death of Christ propitiates God.

4. **Christ Died to Redeem Man.**—The death of Christ is often represented in the Scriptures as a redemption, and men are said to be redeemed through his death. Other words of similar import are used to express the same idea, such as ransomed, purchased, and bought. "Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood" (Acts 20:28). "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:24). "Ye are not your own. For ye are bought with a price" (1 Cor. 6:19, 20). "In whom we have redemption through his blood" (Eph. 1:7). "Ye are not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, . . . but with the precious blood of Christ" (1 Pet. 1:18, 19). "Christ Jesus . . . gave himself a ransom for all" (1 Tim. 2:5, 6).

Those who deny a Godward aspect of the atonement affirm that redemption implies only deliverance. They regard only the effect, and reject the cause of it. The very words in the foregoing passages, redeem, ransom, purchase, and bought, which well express the idea of the Greek text, imply more than mere deliverance. They imply a deliverance as from slavery, exile, or penalty by means of a buying back to a former condition by the payment of a price. That price which is paid is represented in the Greek as a λύτρον (*lutron*), a ransom or redemption. The Scriptures represent salvation through Christ as more than a restoration to a former condition. It is restora-

tion by a buying back, a redemption, and the price paid is the precious blood of Christ.

Various objections have been made to the idea of Christ's death being a redemption in the sense here described. Certain of the early Church Fathers assumed the sufferings of Christ were a ransom paid to Satan. But they got their idea from their own reasoning and in no sense from the Scriptures. Because the theory has no ground in Revelation it was subsequently rejected by the church generally. Yet the opponents have not failed to make that rejected theory an occasion for jests and disparagement of the true doctrine. But error by some in explaining the doctrine is not a disproof of the doctrine itself.

Opposers especially object that because the Scripture teaches that salvation is by grace and is given freely of God, therefore it can not also be a result of purchase by the payment of a price. This argument would have weight if a commercial transaction were the subject under consideration. In such a case the payment of a debt satisfies all claims and there remains no room for the exercise of grace. But the sinner is guilty and is under sentence of death. To omit the infliction of that penalty on the sinner without atonement would violate the divine holiness and result in the downfall of God's government. Christ graciously dies in the sinner's stead, so that in some sense the law and character of God are vindicated while he freely pardons the sinner. Yet the death of Christ was not a substitute for man's suffering of penalty in such a sense that it becomes a matter of justice with God to remit the penalty for sin of all those for whom he died, as Calvinism has held. The paying of the ransom of the sinner is not of such a nature that the exercise of free grace in the individual's pardon is excluded. The Bible explicitly teaches that the death of Christ is redemptive and yet that sin is actually pardoned when the individual believes on Christ.

The expressions redemption, purchase, and ransom, like propitiation, reconciliation, and atonement, when used of the death of Christ are to be understood as having a figurative sense. They are commercial and judicial terms, and have only a limited application to the great spiritual truths of the atonement. Like all figures, parables, and symbols, it is possible to press them too far in various details to the misrepresentation of the truth they

are intended to teach. The different commercial terms such as redeem and purchase have been pressed too far by Calvinists in connection with the idea of a limited atonement. They have interpreted these terms to mean that Christ suffered the exact amount that all the elect deserved to suffer for their sins, and that because he has thus purchased their salvation it would be a matter of injustice on the part of God if he did not certainly save all those for whom Christ died.

5. **Christ Died to Declare God's Righteousness.**—This is most positively stated in the Scriptures. "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to *declare his righteousness* for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; *to declare,* I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. 3:24-26). This plain statement by inspiration as to the purpose of Christ's death certainly leaves no room for rejection of a Godward element in the atonement. The suffering of Christ proclaims that God is righteous or holy and in doing so meets the demands of justice in such a sense that God is shown just while he justifies the ungodly.

But how does the death of Jesus declare the divine righteousness? Answers to this question differ among those who accept the objective element of the atonement as set forth in the foregoing quotation from Paul. One class affirms that while we are certain the death of Christ does declare the righteousness of God because it is so stated by Revelation, we can not know how it declares it because this is not revealed. Doubtless the variety of opinions set forth on this point is reason for modesty in making assertions. Yet it is legitimate to inquire what is meant by the passage under consideration. Even if complete knowledge is not attainable here it is reasonable to believe a degree of understanding is possible. Differences in the interpretation of this statement of the Scriptures are usually the result of some claiming to find more in it than others believe it teaches.

The theory that the death of Christ has no necessary connection with the forgiveness of sins, but is a purely arbitrary arrangement by which God is pleased to represent himself as being righteous, is objectionable. "It behooved Christ to suffer."

In other words, it was necessary that he should suffer. It was not necessary as opposed to contingency, or he was not compelled to suffer, but it was necessary to something else—the pardon of sinners. "There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me" (John 14:6). In its essential nature the death of Christ declares God's righteousness.

How, then, is the death of Christ in our stead a propitiation, a redemption, and a declaration of the divine holiness? These questions are in a great measure identical. A partial answer has been given more than once in the foregoing pages. The death of Christ removes the bar to pardon and makes possible the non-execution of penalty on the sinner. It does not eliminate the need of pardon. It does not bring it to pass that the sinner has not committed his past sins. It does not change the fact that he was responsible for his sinful acts. It does not change the fact of his guilt and desert of punishment. It does not change the fact that he may be justly punished or that the penalty may be justly inflicted upon him.

The death of Christ does make possible to God an order of non-execution of penalty on the sinner without any sacrifice of his personal holiness and without any lowering of the dignity of his holy law. It accomplishes the same result in these respects as would the infliction of the penalty on the sinner who is pardoned. It is declarative in that it is exponential of the important truth that God is a holy being and a righteous ruler. It satisfies the divine justice, both essential and administrative, in that it declares them by attaining their ends, which are the glory of God and the well-being of men.

But what would be the consequences if God should order non-execution of penalty on the sinner without the death of Christ or a proper atonement? Evidently the natural and inevitable result on the part of the subjects of God's government to the extent they became aware of the failure to execute penalty would be to cease to respect that government. The moral Ruler himself would be despised, his law would cease to be obeyed, the threats of penalty would become meaningless, and government would give place to anarchy. But this is not the only bar to pardon. If the penalty on the sinner were remitted without atonement, God would cease to appear as a holy being.

The moral law is holy because its giver is holy. God's law is determined by his own inner character. Then atonement is a vindication, not only of God's righteous law, but also of his personal holiness. Since Christ has at infinite cost made an atonement by suffering in man's stead as a declaration of the righteousness of God, if man repents, thus giving assurance of future good conduct, and trusts in the mercy of God through the atonement Christ has made, there is no obstacle to the order by God of non-execution of penalty upon him. No evil will result, but great good will follow in the well-being of the person pardoned and in the glory of God. While God freely justifies the ungodly, the death of Christ testifies that sin can not be pardoned unless the ends of penalty are met.

IV. Reconciliation in the Old Testament Sacrifices

Devout readers of the Scriptures have commonly believed the Bible teaches that certain institutions and acts of the Old Testament are typical of spiritual truths of the gospel. If proof can be given that these are types—not mere "expressions of natural religion," as is affirmed by skeptics, but divinely given types—then we may discover in a degree the nature of the antitypical truth by a study of the type. With evidence that the atonement for sin by the animal sacrifices of true religion in pre-Christian times was typical of the atonement of Christ, we may legitimately interpret his atonement in the light of those typical offerings. The general ideas of the typical must apply to the true atonement.

1. **Animal Sacrifices Typify Christ.**—A type is an action or institution divinely prepared and appointed to represent a religious truth and to foreshow, by resemblance, those facts in the work of Christ on which the truth symbolized rests. A type is based on the fact of resemblance, but differs from a mere simile in that this analogy is not a result of chance, but is so because divinely preordained to typify. Because of the predictive element in them, types may be called prophetic similitudes or acted prophecies as distinguished from those which are spoken. As surely as spoken prophecies furnish ground for doctrinal formulation so do these acted prophecies.

The New Testament writers clearly and repeatedly represent the Mosaic institutions as being typical. "Let no man therefore

judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days: *Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ''* (Col. 2:16, 17). The Levitical priests are said to ''serve unto the *example* and *shadow* of heavenly things'' (Heb. 8:5). The Mosaic tabernacle was ''a *figure''* (Heb. 9:9), *''patterns* of things in the heavens,'' and *''figures* of the true'' (Heb. 9:23, 24). These and other texts not only show that the different institutions and rites of the law were types, shadows—faint sketches, or adumbrations—but also that Christ and his redemptive work are the antitype or substance by which the shadows were cast.

The offerings themselves are specifically described as being types of Christ, the true offering for sin. ''For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect'' (Heb. 10:1). Here the implication is clear that the reason those animal sacrifices were not efficacious in the permanent removal of guilt was because they were but shadows of a true offering for sin. In the fifth, tenth, fourteenth, and nineteenth verses of this chapter the offering of the body of Christ and his blood are shown to be the true offering foreshadowed by those ancient animal sacrifices. Christ was ''the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world'' (John 1:29). Peter said we are redeemed ''with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot'' (1 Pet. 1:19). With this positive proof that the Old Testament sacrifices were divinely given types of the death of Christ, we may properly interpret the latter in the light of the former, while the New Testament teaching about the atonement serves as a guide to the interpreting of the Old Testament animal sacrifices.

2. **Old Testament Sacrifices were Expiatory.**—It is not required that the animals which were sacrificed on God's altars suffered as much as the guilty offerer should have suffered, but in some sense they were for the expiation of sin. In Lev. 17:11 the eating of blood is forbidden and the reason given why it must not be eaten. ''For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul [by reason of the life—A. S. V.].'' The last clause of this

verse implies that the blood makes atonement because of the life which is in it, this being a restatement of the first clause of the verse, which says "the life of the flesh is in the blood." Modern science has discovered what was stated by Moses, that the blood is the physical seat of life. The life of the animal resides in the blood. Therefore when it was sprinkled upon God's altars for expiation, it was the offering of a life to God instead of the life of the sinner which had been forfeited by sin, which is in full agreement with the New Testament representation that the death of Christ is propitiatory and substitutional. For this reason blood is represented as being necessary to expiation of sin. This great truth was enforced in the offerings of Cain and Abel. Abel's was accepted because a bloody offering. Cain's was rejected because it was a vegetable offering without blood. The writer to the Hebrews states that it was rejected because it was not offered in faith. But Cain evidently had faith in the Divine existence and providence, else he would have brought no offering. But he did not have faith in the divine requirement of vicarious atonement by a life offered as a substitute for his own. His was a bloodless religion and was rejected of God, as must be that of men today who reject the expiatory or Godward element in the death of Christ.

That those animal sacrifices were vicarious is clear. One essential to every animal sacrifice under the Levitical system was that before he killed the sacrifice the offerer must lay or lean his hand upon it. By that solemn act he identified himself with it in such a sense that it might become his substitute and die in his stead. The vicarious nature of animal offerings is nowhere more clearly portrayed than in the offering of the first Passover. The destroying angel is represented as passing through the land at midnight to destroy the first-born in every home. But on the condition that in each Israelitish home a lamb would be sacrificed and its blood sprinkled upon the posts and lintels of the doors the angel would pass over those homes and the first-born would be spared. This is plainly an instance of vicarious suffering. The lamb dies that the first-born might not die. An inspired New Testament writer has so explained the sacrifice of Christ. "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. 5:7). Further comment is unnecessary to prove that the sacrifice of the Passover is typical of the death of Christ

and that the vicarious element in the former is confirmatory of the New Testament teaching that the death of Christ is in our stead.

The solemn rites connected with the sin-offering on the great Day of Atonement very definitely prove the death of Christ is for the removal of sin. The very name of this important sacred season when Israel were to afflict their souls shows that atonement was the leading idea in its observance. Two goats were brought as a sin-offering for the whole congregation. One of them was killed and its blood sprinkled before the Lord in expiation of the sins of the people. On the other goat, the scapegoat, the high priest laid both his hands and confessed over it all the sins of the people of Israel, after which it was sent away to an uninhabited region. By this double symbol sin is represented as being both expiated by the death of a substitute and also borne away. In the tenth chapter of Hebrews this annual national atonement is said to typify the atonement of Christ. Therefore as the first goat died for the expiation of the sins of Israel, so Christ died to make satisfaction for our sins; and as the second goat is represented as having the sins of the people laid upon it, so in some sense our sins are laid upon Christ, who bears them away.

Again, the unclean are represented as being made clean by virtue of sin-offerings. Those who had incurred ceremonial defilement were barred from the house of God on pain of death. Not until a sin-sacrifice was offered for them were they regarded as clean (Lev. 15:31). Likewise those morally defiled can come into the Divine presence and escape death, the penalty for sin, only through the death of Christ, by which alone they can be made clean.

V. Elements in the Biblical Doctrine of Reconciliation

The foregoing consideration of the teaching of the Scriptures concerning the atonement of Christ leads to the conclusion that the atonement is connected with the salvation of men and that it is necessary to their being saved. Even at the risk of some repetition, as a summary of what has been said and to give more definite form to the doctrine, it is now important to direct attention to the several elements of the doctrine as found in the Scriptures. These elements may be divided into (1) the

subjective or manward aspects, and (2) the objective or Godward aspects.

1. **Subjective Elements.**—Some theories of the atonement affirm that no bar to pardon exists as far as God is concerned and that the only reason why the death of Christ is necessary to man's salvation is in order to persuade him to forsake evil and accept God's pardon. Consequently these theories deny any Godward element in the atonement of Christ. Such theories are doubtless inadequate in the light of the Scriptures. Yet they do contain certain elements of truth that must be included in any true view of the reconciliation accomplished by Christ. We very willingly allow all of these subjective elements.

Foremost of these is the truth that the death of Christ is a marvelous manifestation of divine love which is calculated to produce repentance and love for God in return. This exhibition of the love of God in Christ is often pointed to by the Biblical writers as an important purpose of his death. Doubtless also it is of great value as an example to all the followers of Christ of moral heroism in the cause of right. Many have counted themselves happy to fill up the measure of the sufferings of Christ and unflinchingly to face persecution and death because of the inspiration of that example. Again, the death of Christ is of great value in man's salvation as an antecedent to his resurrection from the dead, which is often represented as an evidence that he was all he claimed to be. This is the "sign of the prophet Jonah" which Jesus said would be given, and it is the evidence of his Messiahship to which Paul appealed in his remarkable sermon on Mars' Hill. A fourth reason for the death of Christ for man's salvation is its proclamation of his sincerity as a teacher or his full belief of his own teaching. It is not conceivable that he would voluntarily die for what he knew to be false; therefore he believed what he taught. In addition to these manward elements of the atonement which have characterized the Socinian doctrine may be added the Bushnellian idea that an important value of Christ's work lies in its authentic manifestation of God, through the most effective means of manifestation—vicarious suffering. Doubtless this is adapted to draw out the sinner's love for God and bring to him most vividly the great truth that God is good and ought to have his allegiance and that he should be good also as is God. These

are indeed Scriptural truths and properly elements of the true doctrine of the atonement, but they do not include all the elements, nor even the most important elements of the doctrine.

2. **Objective Elements.**—Different objective elements in the atonement have been shown by the foregoing review of the Scripture statements on the subject. While we should allow all these, we do well to guard the doctrine from erroneous ideas that have often been held as objective elements.

Christ's death is in our stead or substitutional, so we need not die as a penalty for sin. His death is propitiatory, or a reconciliation, to propitiate God. This does not imply that the love of the Son is set over against the justice of the Father. The Father himself "so loved the world" that he gave his Son for their salvation. Both Father and Son possess equally all the divine attributes, including both justice and love. Christ's death is propitiatory in that it removes the bar to pardon. His death is redemptive, or is a ransom or price paid to buy back to a former condition. This does not mean that it is a price paid to Satan, but is a satisfaction to the justice of God. Here the commercial idea is not to be pressed so far as to imply that Christ suffered the exact amount which all the elect should have suffered throughout eternity. His humiliation and death are an infinite price because of the infinite dignity of the offering. His death is also declarative in the sense that it proclaims the righteousness of God and the holiness of his law. In so doing the death of Christ witnesses to God's displeasure of sin and makes pardon possible. In the light of the Scriptures these must be regarded as Godward elements of the atonement.

The atonement, then, is for man's salvation, is necessary to his salvation, and is universal in its extent in that it makes possible the salvation of all men.

Chapter III

APPLICATION OF REDEMPTION

With the proof of the truth of atonement through Christ for man's redemption, the questions next to claim our attention are: What benefits are ours through the death of Christ? Are these benefits available to all men or for a selected number? Are they bestowed unconditionally upon those for whom they are intended or is their application to the individual dependent upon his voluntarily appropriating them by meeting requisite conditions? If salvation is conditional what are those conditions? All of these are important questions.

I. Unconditional Benefits of the Atonement

Salvation from the penalty of sin is commonly thought of as the chief purpose of the atonement, which is doubtless true, but several other benefits also are derived from it. Some of these are conditional on man's part and some are in their very nature unconditional.

1. **Individual Existence.**—The threatened penalty for sin of the first pair was death. This included spiritual death. The apostle Paul states that "sin revived, and I died" (Rom. 7:9). Death as a consequence of sin is frequently represented in the Sacred Writings as a present state. But the penalty for that first sin also included physical death. This is certain from the necessity of barring Adam and Eve from the tree of life when they had sinned, lest they eat of it and live forever. But if the full penalty for sin in respect to physical death had been immediately executed when the first sin was committed, the race would have been cut off at its beginning, and none of the descendants of the first pair would have ever existed. It is inconceivable, considering what human nature is, that the race could have been propagated from Adam and Eve after their spirits became disembodied.

The only ground for delay in the execution of physical death is the atonement of Christ. Only because the seed of the woman was to bruise the head of the serpent and make salvation possible, God could consistently spare Adam to repentance, and permit the propagation of a race that could likewise be saved. Divine goodness is reconcilable with the permission of the exist-

ence of the race only on the ground that a way would be made for their redemption from that morally helpless condition consequent on Adam's sin. The question may be asked at this point, Would it not have been more consistent with divine goodness had the existence of the race been cut off with the first sin than that millions of moral beings should have been exposed to the possibility of endless punishment? No special problem relative to the goodness of God exists at this point. If the redemption provided by Christ does not vindicate God in the continuance of a race of moral beings after Adam's sin, then there is no vindication of God's original creation of such beings. The question raised here is identical with the general problem of theodicy already considered. Great goodness is manifested by God in giving existence to free beings. Existence and freedom may be wrongly used and so become great evils, as do many other blessings, but in themselves they are benefits of inestimable value.

Every blessing that comes to man—every physical pleasure, the joy that comes through knowledge, the happiness of love and hope, and of the domestic relations, the capacity for thought, by which skeptics endeavor to deny the work of Christ—is due to existence itself, and existence is an unconditional benefit of the atonement.

2. **Possibility of Universal Salvation.**—The death of Christ did not make the salvation of all men actual, but it so declared the righteousness of God that God might consistently offer salvation on the ground of that atonement without any reflection on his holiness as a divine person or as moral ruler. Salvation is made *possible* through the atonement. Because the possibility of the salvation of men is secured regardless of the choice of themselves, therefore it is an unconditional benefit of the atonement. Also the possibility of salvation is procured by the death of Christ for *all* men. In this sense especially he is the "Savior of all men." Christ by the grace of God tasted death "for every man" (Heb. 2:9). But the universality of the reconciliation of Christ is deferred for fuller discussion in its appropriate place.

3. **Salvation for Those Dying in Infancy.**—There was a time when the unscriptural assumption was prevalent that infants who died without baptism were lost. Evangelical Christians of

the present are almost unanimous in repudiating that theory. Though the Bible does not explicitly state that infants who die go to heaven, the implication is clear. In the light of the revealed love and justice of God, it is inconceivable that God should allow them to be lost. Also Jesus said, "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 19:14).

Infants have no guilt and are not punishable. They are not morally responsible and therefore do not deserve penalty for their own acts. Neither does any guilt attach to them because of Adam's sin, in which they had no part, nor does their inherited depravity merit penalty. The salvation of infants through Christ's atonement, then, can not refer to their being saved from punishment. Yet they are depraved naturally, and in its very nature that perversion of moral nature constitutes an obstacle to full blessedness in this world or in heaven. Moreover, because only the pure in heart can see God, and morally depraved beings are unfit to associate with holy angels and redeemed saints in heaven, it follows that those dying in infancy must be sanctified from that depravity of their natures unconditionally through the atonement of Christ.

Aside from native depravity, the infant in no way differs from newly created beings. He has no moral desert. He deserves no punishment nor merits reward. In this he differs from those who have passed a period of probation. Therefore the title of infants to heaven and their blessedness there must be unconditional through the merits of Christ and his atonement. But here the difficulty is met that led to the complaints of certain of the servants in the parable of the Vineyard—is it just that those who have borne the burden and stress of probationary testing should be rewarded no more than those saved without effort? Probably at least a partial solution of the difficulty is found in the distinction between salvation and reward. All are saved by grace, but in addition it may be assumed is reward which is in proportion to one's faithfulness. "Our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding, and eternal weight of glory" (2 Cor. 4:17). The unconditional salvation of infants through the atonement of Christ consists, then, in the sanctification of their natures from native

depravity, and the procuring for them a title to heaven and blessedness therein.

4. **Power Requisite for Probation.**—As a result of natural depravity unregenerate men are unable of themselves continually to do good or to choose good for its own sake. Jesus said, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him" (John 6:44). Only by the revelation of the Spirit of God can spiritual truth be truly known (Matt. 16:17). Christ "was the true Light, which lighteth *every* man that cometh into the world" (John 1:9). "The grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men" (Titus 2:11). These texts leave no place for the theory of Semi-Pelagianism that man has natural power to forsake sin and turn to God without divine aid. In the light of the fact that the divine drawing is necessary to the repentance of a sinner, it follows that the conditions for a fair probation require that there be afforded to all men unconditionally gracious help in order to repentance. Such gracious influence is procured and freely given to all unconditionally through the atonement of Christ. This gracious help is the chief requisite to a fair probation for depraved man.

In objection to the idea that man in this life is under conditions suitable to probation, it is sometimes pointed out that probationary privileges are unequally distributed. Some persons are more depraved naturally, have less opportunity for knowledge of the will of God, and enjoy less of religious influence than do others. Evidently this is all true. But it is also true that "unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required"; and he to whom less is given, of him God will require less. The inequality in opportunity will be equalized in corresponding retribution. Obligation is equal to, but never in excess of one's ability. Therefore if one may be lost it is certain that he may be saved. If he has power to sin he necessarily has power, either naturally or by grace, to refrain from sinning. This follows from the nature of sin.

That all men have capacity and opportunity for a fair probation in the present life is questioned especially in the case of the heathen. Though the Scriptures do not state specifically that the heathen have conditions suitable to a fair probation, yet it is properly inferred from what the Bible says that they have such conditions. In the light of a principle already stated, if

the heathen have no knowledge of right nor sense of moral duty they have no responsibility and will be saved on the same ground as are infants or idiots.

But it is evident that all men may have some knowledge of God through his works in nature. Such evidence is continually before them. "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse" (Rom. 1:19, 20). By intuition and rational processes all may know God is, and to the extent he is known by men they are obligated to worship and do what they believe would please him. The apostle Paul wrote of the heathen of his day that though they did not have the written revelation of God's will, yet they "do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts in the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another" (Rom. 2:14, 15). All men are obligated to conform to the requirements of their conscience, and only by so doing can they be saved.

If it be objected that the heathen can not live according to their conscience without regeneration and without the divine drawing can not obtain regeneration, we reply that there is reason for believing the gracious help of the Holy Spirit is offered to all men, even to those without the written revelation of God. God reveals himself directly even to heathen. Probable examples of these are Abraham, Melchisedek, and Job. Who can say that God does not today and has not in all ages revealed himself to all men in proportion to their willingness to serve him, that they might trust in his mercy for salvation? It is certainly not necessary to one's salvation that he have a historical knowledge of Christ and understand the atonement, for many in nominally Christian lands are converted without such knowledge. Though salvation is always through Christ, yet one need not know that it is so nor how it is so in order to his salvation.

That divine help is given to all men that they might obtain salvation is properly inferred from the Scriptures and reason.

That retribution is to be according to light and ability is clearly taught in the Bible. Therefore the conditions for a fair probation are afforded to all men in this life. If this is not so, then another probation period must be yet future, which idea is contrary to the Scriptures.

II. Conditional Benefits of the Atonement

The benefits of the atonement hitherto considered are immediate in that they are conferred on the individual without the requirement of any action on his part in order to their reception. Attention is now directed to what may be properly designated as conditional benefits. These may be enjoyed only by one's voluntarily appropriating them by the meeting of divinely specified requirements. The nature of this class of benefits is deferred for later discussion. Our present purpose is to show the truth of their conditionality.

1. **Salvation from Sin Conditional.**—Salvation from sin in its broad aspect as here used includes, not only pardon, but also regeneration, entire sanctification, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and power to live a holy life. All of these are obtainable only by one's voluntarily meeting proper conditions. But proof of the conditionality of the initial work of salvation is especially important, for when this is established the conditionality of the other aspects of salvation mentioned are generally admitted, and particularly is this proof important because it is on this point that Calvinism has denied conditionality. Grounds for the possibility of the conditionality of salvation are: (1) the power of alternative choice, which has previously been shown to be an essential faculty of human nature; (2) the divine drawing of the sinner to Christ, which adequately supplies the natural lack of inclination to righteousness because of depravity; (3) divinely specified requirements clearly set forth in revelation as necessary to salvation.

The Scriptures very definitely represent forgiveness of sin as conditional. The principal Scripture texts in support of this are those which connect the meeting of certain conditions with salvation from the penalty of sin. Repentance and faith are most commonly set forth as the necessary conditions for pardon. "He that *believeth and is baptized* shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:16). Nothing is

clearer in this Great Commission than that the personal appropriation of the salvation proclaimed by the apostles was altogether optional with the hearers. In their subsequent preaching the apostles preached salvation as available only to those who met proper conditions. "Then Peter said unto them, *Repent, and be baptized* every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2:38). Here repentance is made conditional to salvation.

In answer to the Philippian Jailer's inquiry, "What must I do to be saved?" Paul said, "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved" (Acts 16:31). In harmony with the words of Jesus in the Great Commission, the Apostle to the Gentiles here teaches faith as the condition for pardon. No truth is given greater prominence in the Pauline writings than the important truth that salvation is conditional on men's voluntary faith in Christ. This is the sense of the extended argument of the first nine chapters of the Roman espistle. Examples of many specific statements in that argument are: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation *to every one that believeth*" (Rom. 1:16). "But to him that worketh not, *but believeth* on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness" (Rom. 4:5). Of equal value with the foregoing texts in proof of the conditionality of salvation is the great word of our Lord, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth* in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16).

Another class of texts which confirm and add strength to those already given as proof that personal application of salvation is dependent upon the meeting of requisite conditions by the sinner, are those which declare that those persons who do not meet such conditions will not be saved. "He that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:16). "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already" (John 3:18). "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him" (v. 36).

Reason also gives support to the truth of the conditionality of salvation. We have already shown that man is free in secular affairs. In morals he has power to choose to do righteously

by the grace of God, or to choose to commit sin. If he were pardoned of past sins without repentance he would at once again become guilty and his pardon would avail nothing. Therefore on the ground of his moral freedom, repentance is a necessary condition of pardon. Also in view of the fact that the atonement makes pardon possible by the vindication of God's holiness, it is a necessary condition for salvation that the sinner believe in that atonement if it is to serve its intended purpose of declaring the righteousness of God while he justifies the guilty.

Though justification and regeneration are distinct in nature, yet they are effected simultaneously, and the same act of faith is the condition for both. Entire sanctification and the Holy Spirit baptism, which also occur simultaneously, are through prayer (Luke 11:13) and faith (Acts 26:18). The exercise of the keeping power of God is "through faith" (1 Pet. 1:5).

2. **Special Providence Through Prayer.**—In addition to salvation from sin are various other gracious benefits that may be obtained through prayer and faith. There is a true voluntariness in prayer, even though faith is inspired directly by the Holy Spirit. These gracious benefits through prayer can not properly be classed with other special providences which God bestows on his children unconditionally, such as special protection from unforeseen danger.

Not the least of these special providences through prayer is divine physical healing. This, like salvation, is a conditional benefit of the atonement. That it is through the atonement is stated in the Scriptures. "Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses" (Matt. 8:17). This is quoted from the great atonement chapter of the Old Testament, Isaiah 53, and evidently means that through his atoning death he made possible our physical healing. All other benefits received in answer to prayer are through the atonement, by which alone God may consistently bless those deserving of penalty. These other benefits include material blessings—such as food, clothing, or shelter—divine guidance, and comfort when obtained through special prayer.

3. **Future Blessedness.**—Future blessedness of men is represented throughout the Bible as conditioned upon their voluntary choice and action. The first step essential to future blessedness

in heaven is pardon of sin and divine help to refrain from sinning thereafter, both of which are conditional. The second thing essential to blessedness in the future life is voluntary obedience to God's Word throughout life after conversion.

The great burden of Jesus' teaching concerning his second coming in Matthew 24 was that men "be ready" for it by righteous conduct. In the parables of the Ten Virgins and of the Talents the same general truth is emphasized. Also the description of the last judgment, in Matthew 25, represents the blessedness of the righteous as the consequence of their past benevolent conduct. It is not to be supposed that Jesus taught salvation from guilt is obtainable by works, but when one has been justified by grace he must live righteously to retain that justification and to gain blessedness in heaven.

III. Universality of the Opportunity for Salvation

No point concerning the application of salvation has been the subject of more controversy than that of the extent of the opportunity for salvation. This question necessarily includes another—the extent of the atonement. Did Christ die for all men or for only an elect company? If he died for all, is the opportunity of salvation therefore alike to all? These questions are not identical. A certain modified form of Calvinism holds that Christ died for all men in that his sacrifice was infinite and sufficient for all, but that the opportunity to be actually saved is granted only to the elect.

The question concerning who may be saved through Christ naturally leads to the Calvinistic controversy on the one hand and to the contention of Universalism on the other. Pure Calvinism affirms that the sufferings of Christ were sufficient only for the elect, and therefore that only the elect can possibly be saved. Opportunity of salvation is not afforded to the non-elect. A fuller review of the Calvinistic system is reserved for the following division of this chapter. The common theory of universalism begins with the commercial theory of the atonement usually held by Calvinists. Universalists assume, as do Calvinists, that all those for whom Christ died will be certainly and unconditionally saved. But instead of holding that Christ died only for the elect, they declare he died for all men; therefore all men will be saved. The proofs given in the preceding divi-

sion of this chapter of the conditionality of salvation, if connected with the proofs of the universality of the atonement, constitute complete disproof of this Universalist theory.

Our present purpose is not to show that all men will be saved, but that all men have the opportunity to be saved if they choose. Only from the Scriptures can we know what is the extent of the atonement, and for whom salvation is actually offered.

1. **Christ Died for All Men.**—Not one text in all the Bible states directly that Christ did not die for all men or that he died only for an elect company. No advocate of a limited atonement pretends that there exists any such direct proof of his theory. But many texts specifically affirm, or clearly imply, that he did die for all men. Of Jesus it is said "that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man" (Heb. 2:9). No language could more definitely declare that Christ died for all men than does this text. "Every man" means *every* man. It can not be properly interpreted to mean anything else. The idea of a limited atonement, or that Christ did not die for all, is entirely excluded.

It is further said of Christ, "Who gave himself a ransom for all" (1 Tim. 2:6). And again, "He died for all" (2 Cor. 5:15). These are equally conclusive with the words of the writer to the Hebrews in support of a universal atonement. We readily allow that "all" and other universal terms may sometimes be used in a limited sense in the Bible, as they are in common speech, but certainly the word "all" is not so used in this latter text. The proof of the fullest universal sense of the term in the passage under consideration is in the immediate context. "We thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead." Here the universality of spiritual death is argued from the means employed for raising men to spiritual life. Therefore the evident fact that spiritual death is universal, which even Calvinists admit, is proof that the death of Christ is for all men or equally universal as an atonement.

Also it is said of Christ, "He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 John 2:2). This and other texts which represent Christ as dying for the entire world constitute another class of passages in support of the universality of the atonement.

2. **Salvation Is for All Men.**—A certain modified form of Calvinism avoids the difficulties of a limited-atonement theory by affirming that Christ died for all men, but it denies that salvation is offered to any except the elect. In opposition to such a theory the Scriptures teach salvation is for all men. "For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is *the Savior of all men,* specially of those that believe." Unless God be the Savior of all men in a sense similar to that in which he especially saves those who believe, then the analogy the Apostle here draws is without foundation in fact. If it were true that some were certainly reprobated unconditionally to everlasting punishment, no temporal benefit could properly be called salvation in any sense. The sense of the text evidently is that the salvation of all men is possible and salvation becomes actual to those who believe. In this respect God is specially the Savior of believers.

An example of another class of texts which show that the salvation of all is made possible is John 3:16, 17. "For God so loved *the world,* that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever* believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. . . . That the world through him might be saved." The term "whosoever" in this passage, like other universal terms already considered, must properly be understood of all men. It is coextensive with "the world," and the "whole world" (1 John 2:2). The term "world" can not be properly paraphrased the "world of the elect." The elect are never called the world by the Scriptures, but are represented as having been called out of it. Jesus said, "Ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you" (John 15:19). If the "world" in this text meant the elect it would declare whosoever of that elect world for whom Christ died would believe in him should not perish, implying that those of the elect who do not believe will perish, which would be self-contradictory.

It may also be argued in favor of the universality of the opportunity of salvation that the redemption provided by Christ is coextensive with the effects of Adam's sin. "But not as the offense, so also is the free gift. For if through the offense of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto

many. . . . Therefore as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life" (Rom. 5:15, 18). That Christ has provided salvation for all those lost through Adam's sin is shown by the same language being applied to both—"judgment came upon *all men.*" Even Calvinists admit the "all men" of the first statement includes all the descendants of Adam. Then the salvation provided by Christ is affirmed in the second clause to be for the entire human race.

3. **The Gospel Is to Be Preached to All.**—"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:15, 16). These solemn words clearly teach that the gospel is for all. Belief of it produces salvation, but disbelief leads to punishment. It is therefore implied that it is the duty of all men to believe. But why should the gospel be preached to all men if many of them are predestinated to eternal punishment? They could not possibly do other than reject it and so increase their damnation. If it makes possible to them no mercy it is not glad tidings, but a message of doom.

If it is the divinely enjoined duty of all men to believe on Christ, then such belief is possible. If it is not possible, God is unjust in requiring it and insincere in offering it. If it is the duty of one to exercise saving faith in Christ for salvation, that faith must be preceded by the belief that Christ has actually provided salvation for him. But if the atonement is limited to the elect, then all others are required to believe a falsehood. Moreover, not one of the elect can logically exercise saving faith or trust in the mercy of God through Christ unless he first have assurance *before he is converted* that he is of the elect and therefore that there is salvation in Christ for him.

Only on the ground that Christ died for all men, that pardon is possible to all, and that all may actually believe and be saved can the justice of God and the sincerity of the Lord Jesus be vindicated in the giving of the Great Commission.

4. **God Wills the Salvation of All.**—"For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God: wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye" (Ezek. 18:32). "As I live, saith

the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live" (Ezek. 33: 11). "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior; who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2:3, 4). "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (2 Pet. 3:9). These and many other texts of similar meaning which might be cited, so clearly represent God as unwilling that men should be lost and desirous that they be saved that little comment is needed.

The last text quoted plainly states that God is "not willing that any should perish." Therefore those who perish do so contrary to God's will, and not as a result of it as the Calvinistic doctrine of reprobation of the non-elect to punishment implies. God's attitude towards those who perish is not merely one of passive willingness. He "will have all men to be saved." This implies that those who perish do so in spite of all God can do. It implies that he would not fail to provide atonement for them and give whatever assisting grace is necessary to their acceptance of salvation. God has done and is doing his part to save all men. If they are not saved it is not his fault. This is evident from a casual reading of the Scriptures.

The failure of men to be saved is represented in the Bible as being due to their own fault in not accepting God's offered mercy. "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" (Matt. 23:37). "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life" (John 5:40). These and all other texts which teach that men are lost because of their own refusal to accept salvation are proof that the atonement and the gracious help to be saved are provided for all. The destruction of sinners is described as being self-secured, which implies that their salvation was possible. If no atonement was made for reprobates and if no gracious help to accept salvation was provided, then men could not properly be represented as responsible for their own destruction. The only reasonable sense of those texts which declare men are lost through their own fault is that all now have the opportunity to be saved, and that God has provided salvation for them and endowed them either by

nature or by grace with power freely to accept it or to reject it.

The universality of the opportunity for the salvation of all men is evident from the statements of the Scriptures already cited. Christ died for all men, not only for the elect. Salvation is provided for all, and all may actually be saved who choose to meet the conditions on which it is offered. All have power to meet those conditions. Jesus commanded that the gospel be preached to every creature and promised that salvation would be the portion of all who would believe it. God desires that all men be saved and has therefore done all he can do to save them. If any are not saved it is their own fault.

IV. Predestination

No scriptural soteriology is complete that omits a consideration of the question of predestination. Some of the questions already discussed in this chapter logically lead to the question of predestination. Heretofore it has been noticed incidentally. Now more particular consideration of it is in order.

1. **The Calvinistic Theory.**—Calvinistic predestinarianism has held a large place in Protestant theology in the past, and has been a matter of extended controversy. The polemic discussion of it has greatly decreased in recent years, partly because of modifications in the views of Calvinists, and partly because of the fruitlessness of past controversy. Yet the Calvinistic system remains substantially unchanged and represents the belief of multitudes of professors of Christianity.

A clear distinction should be made between the Scripture doctrine of predestination and that theory of predestination held by Calvinists. The latter is the first of the notable five points that differentiate Calvinism from Arminianism. The Remonstrants, a number of leading Arminians, formulated and set forth in the year 1610 the five points in which they differed with Calvinism. These are: (1) Conditionality of salvation; (2) Universality of the atonement; (3) Moral freedom; (4) Resistibility of grace; and (5) Possibility of final apostasy. The counter tenets of the Calvinistic system are: (1) Predestination; (2) Limited atonement; (3) Moral necessity; (4) Irresistibility of saving grace; and (5) The absolute final perseverance of believers.

Each of these two groups of doctrines is self-consistent. To

hold any one of the five points logically requires the holding of all the others in that group. If the doctrine of particular predestination were true in the sense that only a part of the race were ordained to salvation, then it would be unreasonable, as true Calvinism holds that atonement should be made for that portion which God had decided not to save. Moral freedom would be excluded in favor of moral inability, as there could be no power to choose what does not exist. The irresistibility of saving grace would follow, for none can resist the purposes of the sovereign will of God. And if God had unconditionally predestinated one to be saved in heaven, he will necessarily cause him, not only to be converted, but to continue faithful to the end.

Of these five points we have already had occasion to discuss the questions of the conditionality of salvation, the extent of the atonement, and free will. Now we are to give special consideration to the theories of predestination and final perseverance.

No higher authority on the Calvinistic theory of predestination can be cited than the Westminster Confession of Faith. It has been revised at different times, especially by the Presbyterian Church in this country in the year 1903, but it is still substantially unchanged on the point of predestination. It reads, "By the decree of God for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. These men and angels, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it can not be either increased or diminished. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them or any other thing in the creature, as conditions and causes moving him thereto, and all to the praise of his glorious grace. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore, they who are elected being fallen in Adam,

are redeemed by Christ; are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by faith in his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elected only. The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own good will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice."

Predestination as here described has its basis in the Calvinistic doctrine of divine decrees. According to this latter doctrine all events are the result of decrees of God from eternity. Decrees concerning the destiny of men and angels are called predestination. The doctrine of decrees is stated in the Westminster creed as follows: "God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass." Disproof of the doctrine of particular predestination will furnish sufficient refutation of the objectional aspects of the doctrine of the divine decrees.

Predestination is used of the divine predetermination of the destinies of men, both good and evil. Those ordained to salvation are said to be the elect. Those ordained to be lost are said to be reprobates.

2. **Election.**—In the Calvinistic sense of the term, election means that choice by God of particular persons to enjoy everlasting blessedness, which choice is made by him "without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving him thereto." Election in the Calvinistic view is wholly by God's sovereign will, and in no sense is it determined by the will or character of those elected. The question which here confronts us for answer is, Is Calvinian election identical with the election described in the Scriptures? Or what is the nature of the latter?

The Scriptures mention three kinds of election. The first is the election of individuals to perform some particular service. Isaac and Jacob were chosen of God instead of Ishmael and Esau to be the progenitors of Christ. Cyrus was chosen to build

the temple, and the twelve apostles were elected by Jesus to fill that high office in his church. But no such election insured them against missing everlasting blessedness. "Judas by transgression fell," and Paul recognized the possibility of his becoming a "castaway." Election in this sense has no more to do with one's being unconditionally chosen to final salvation than does one's being divinely called to the gospel ministry today. Neither can it be shown that such election was irrespective of one's character and qualifications for the performance of such work.

The second kind of election referred to in the Bible is that of nations or groups of persons to exalted religious privileges. A notable example is the nation of Israel, which was elected to be the bearer of true religion and recipient of revelation prior to the advent of Christ. But the election of this nation, as a nation, did not result in an unconditional election to final salvation of the individuals composing it. If this sort of election included the final blessedness of each individual, then rebellious persons like Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, idolaters such as Ahab and Athaliah, and the betrayer and the crucifiers of our Lord will certainly all be saved.

Christians especially are called the "elect." As a class they are elected of God to salvation and future blessedness. As the Jews were once God's chosen people, so now he has elected that all those who believe shall be his people. This is the great truth taught in the ninth chapter of Romans (vs. 24, 30). Whoever chooses to become a believer may join that class and thus become one of the elect. Election of believers, as a class, to salvation through Christ does not imply that particular individuals are unconditionally and infallibly predestinated to it nor that those who have become members have their salvation secured against the possibility of apostasy. Neither does the conditional election here described exclude, or imply the necessary reprobation of, those who fail of election through unbelief.

A third kind of election is that of individuals to divine sonship and future blessedness on the ground of divine foresight of their disposition freely to choose salvation. In the true and Biblical view of personal election men are not unconditionally chosen in order to faith, obedience, and holiness, but *because* of divine foresight of faith and obedience. This conditional pre-

destination is the only kind that is compatible with the definite Scripture teaching of the conditionality of salvation, which has already been discussed. Also it can not be shown that any text of Scripture teaches other than a conditional election of individuals. Jesus said, "I have chosen [elected] you out of the world" (John 15:19). But such choosing out was by his changing their hearts, which, according to other texts, is conditional upon their forsaking the world. Paul said, "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth" (2 Thess. 2:13). The belief of the truth is not the result of the choosing, but the choosing is through foresight of that belief. Peter also writes to his brethren in Christ that they are "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 1:2). In this text election is said to be according to the divine foreknowledge, but that election consists in having the work of salvation effected in their hearts. None are ever said to be of the elect who are not saved.

A text which is especially depended upon by Calvinists for the support of their doctrine of election reads as follows: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified" (Rom. 8:29, 30). In interpreting this 29th verse it is to be read forward, and not backward as the Calvinistic interpretation would require. No unconditional predestination is the ground of God's foreknowledge of particular persons to be saved. The predestination mentioned in this text is because of the divine foreknowledge. "Foreknow" from προέγνω (*proegno*) means simple knowing beforehand. It is to be clearly distinguished from "predestinate," as is done in the text. To "foreknow" as here used is to know beforehand that the particular persons referred to will freely accept the salvation of Christ when it is offered to them. With this sense of "foreknow" what follows is clear. God foresaw that some would freely choose to love and serve him. Therefore he predetermined and made provisions accordingly that they should be "conformed to the image of his Son"

through regeneration by the Spirit. But it was not enough that he should foreknow that some persons would choose to love and obey him, nor yet that he should predetermine to save them. "Them he *also called*" through the preaching of the gospel. These heeded the call of the gospel and consequently were "justified" or pardoned. Lastly, those thus justified are "glorified" with God's presence now and the blessedness of heaven hereafter. No support whatever is given to Calvinistic election by this text. It is only when one's mind is previously filled with the Calvinistic view that he can suppose that theory is supported by this text.

Another text much relied on by predestinarians reads: "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will" (Eph. 1:4, 5). For different reasons this text fails to support Calvinistic election. First there is no proof that the divine election and predestination to adoption is unconditional on the part of those elected. It can not be shown that the divine election of these before the foundation of the world was not on the ground of divine foresight of faith and love on their part. Such must be the nature of any personal election to salvation in the light of the common Scripture teaching of the conditionality of salvation. Again it can not be shown that this passage teaches personal election. The context shows clearly that it affirms, not a personal, but a collective election to the privileges of the gospel. In other words, who are meant by "us"? The antecedent in verse 1 is saints or Christians, whether Jews or Gentiles. This group, believers, are the ones whom God had intended from the earliest period to make his people, and not the Jews, who later had been temporarily regarded as God's elect.

In the ninth chapter of Romans Paul sets forth the same great truth, which evidently was very dear to him, who was the Apostle to the Gentiles. The fact that those to whom Paul wrote consisted of both Jews and Gentiles, and that some Jews were disposed to question the right of the Gentiles to the divine favor, gave special occasion for the statement of this truth. The Apostle teaches that the admission of the Gentiles to the salvation of Christ was not a disregard by God of his promises to

Abraham, nor a contradiction of his former action in especially favoring the Jews, but that from before the time of Abraham, even "before the formation of the world," he had chosen to make those his children who would believe. See Rom. 9:24. The election of the believing Gentiles as well as Jews is frequently mentioned in the Ephesian epistle, especially in chapter 1. After speaking of this election of Christians in general he mentions in verse 12 those who "first trusted in Christ," the believing Jews, after which he says, "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth." The gathering "together in one of all things in Christ" (v. 10) certainly refers to the admission of the Gentiles.

Not only does predestinarianism lack support in these texts on which it most depends, but much positive teaching of the Scripture absolutely excludes it. Proof has already been given of the conditionality of salvation, the universality of the atonement, and the power of alternative choice. These leave no room for unconditional predestination. But they do remarkably affiliate with the sense of predestination here supported.

With the disproof of the unconditional election of a part of mankind to final blessedness, no place remains for the unconditional reprobation of the remaining portion to future punishment. Election and reprobation fall together. Therefore no separate consideration of the latter is necessary.

3. **Absolute Final Perseverance.**—One of the ablest advocates of this doctrine, A. H. Strong, states it as follows: "In view of the original purpose and continuous operation of God, all who are united to Christ by faith will infallibly continue in a state of grace and will finally attain to everlasting life." This doctrine that all who are once converted will certainly be finally saved in heaven is a logically necessary part of the predestinarianism system. If God has decreed whatsoever comes to pass, including the election of a definite number to salvation and final blessedness; if Christ died only for these elect and in such a way that their salvation must inevitably follow; if the saving grace of God is irresistible by the elect—then it logically follows that when they have been saved they will certainly persevere in holiness. But with the proof that Christ died for all, that salvation is possible to all, that all have the power freely to accept it or

reject it, it logically follows that perseverance in holiness, like entrance to it, is optional with the individual.

The following are some of the texts of Scripture which Dr. Strong assumes support the doctrine, but which in truth are altogether inconclusive. "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand" (John 10:27-29). Doubtless this is true from the divine side in that God is able and willing to keep all his people from sinning. But it does not state that he will certainly keep them regardless of their choice to be faithful. Another text cited reads, "For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (Rom. 11:29). This verse affirms only God's faithfulness to fulfil his promises and is best understood in connection with Rom. 9:6. Except on the assumption of an absolute sovereignty of grace, it furnishes no proof of absolute final perseverance. Its use here is a begging of the question. Another text often used reads "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day" (2 Tim. 1:12). This text merely declares the divine ability to keep, but does not state that this keeping by God is certain nor independent of Paul's choice to be kept. Other texts cited are Phil. 1:6; 2 Thess. 3:3; 1 Pet. 1:5; and Rev. 3:10. The foregoing texts are regarded by the ablest advocates of the doctrine as its best Scriptural support, but they are all alike inconclusive.

In opposition to the doctrine it may first be said that it is inconsistent with human freedom. It logically tends to produce carelessness in maintaining holiness of life. The Scriptures teach that "every branch *in me* [Christ] that beareth not fruit he *taketh away*" (John 15:2). Jesus said of those whom his Father had given him that "none of them is lost, but the son of perdition" (John 17:12). Though the apostle Paul was certainly saved and frequently so testified, yet he recognized the need of constant watchfulness "lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway" (1 Cor. 9:27). If apostasy is not possible to Christians, then all those many texts that warn against it are misleading. "Look-

ing diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God'' (Heb. 12:15). ''Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall'' (2 Pet. 1:10). If these texts mean anything it must be that Christians may apostatize.

V. Human Conditions for Salvation

The chief condition on the part of God in the salvation of men is the providing of the atonement through Christ. A secondary objective condition is the divine drawing of the sinner to repentance, which has before been described as an unconditional benefit of the atonement. But, as has been already shown, there are human conditions to be met. The human condition on which pardon is granted must be such that adequate security will be given that the pardoned sinner will cease his sinning; otherwise he will at once become guilty again. Also if pardon were granted without such a pledge of future good conduct, the declaration of the righteousness of God in the atonement would have little value. The divine holiness and law would still be despised by sinners.

The leading human condition, then, must consist in a recognition of the atonement of Christ as a declaration of the righteousness of God. Faith in that atonement as a ground for pardon is in its nature calculated to secure the future good conduct of him who is pardoned. That faith implies conviction of sin, else it would not be exercised. It implies repentance, which is the only attitude in which he can consistently commit himself to the mercy of God for pardon. It must also imply the purpose to obey God, which is an accompaniment of repentance.

1. **Faith in Christ.**—Faith is the primary condition for pardon, and is inclusive of all secondary conditions. Of the very many texts which represent faith in Christ as necessary to pardon, the citation of a few will be sufficient. ''He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life'' (John 3:36). ''Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved'' (Acts 16:31). ''Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ'' (Rom. 5:1). ''For by grace are ye saved through faith'' (Eph. 2:8). Christian experience also corroborates the universal testimony of the Scriptures that faith

is the condition, and the only condition, on which salvation from sin is possible. Men labor in vain to purchase peace with God by their own works. No amount of benevolent deeds or doing penance, no degree of penitence or earnestness in praying, will of itself give relief from the burden of sin. Only when the sinner, recognizing his guilt and helplessness, casts himself on the mercy of God through Christ, is pardon granted and peace realized.

In its very nature saving faith is not mere intellectual assent, as is belief of a historical fact. Neither is it an emotional exercise. It is of such a nature that it may be exercised voluntarily. It is a matter of the will. All men everywhere are commanded to believe. But intellectual assent to a truth is not directly a matter of choice. One can believe a thing is true only as he has adequate evidence that it is true. When he comes into possession of that evidence he believes involuntarily, and has no power directly to refrain from believing. Therefore saving faith is not to be identified with a belief that the Bible is the word of God, nor yet that the particular statements therein given are true. One may believe all these things and yet not be saved. Many unconverted persons do have such belief.

Saving faith is of the nature of self-committal or trust. It is a voluntary reliance or trust in the merits of Christ for forgiveness. It is a confiding in the mercy of God through Christ. The penitent sinner casts himself on the mercy of God which is offered through Christ. He not only believes Christ has suffered in his stead for his sins, but he rests in Christ for the salvation he so much needs. This is justification by faith. It is God's way, and God bids men thus simply to trust. It is a safe way and surely effects peace with God, as many have proved by experience.

But intellectual faith is a basis for saving faith in Christ. Only as one believes that God exists, that the Bible is God's Word, that Christ is his Son and has atoned for sin, and that God offers pardon through him, can saving faith in Christ be exercised. But that specifically Christian faith in God's mercy is doubtless not always absolutely necessary to salvation. If so, then no salvation would be possible to the Old Testament saints, nor to any of the heathen. No one can be saved who refuses

to trust in Christ if he has evidence that Christ is God's remedy for sin.

2. **Repentance.**—The Scriptures give a place to repentance as a condition of salvation which is scarcely inferior to that of faith. Jesus came preaching, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel" (Mark 1:15). In his Pentecostal sermon Peter said to the guilty Jews, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38). Again he said, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out" (Acts 3:19). "God . . . commandeth all men everywhere to repent" (Acts 17:30).

Repentance expresses a twofold idea—a feeling of sincere sorrow and hatred for sin because of its sinfulness, and a definite turning away from sin because of that inward feeling. The original word in the Scriptures signifies a change of mind. The first aspect of repentance, the inward feeling of grief, is identical with godly sorrow which "worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of" (2 Cor. 7:10). Godly sorrow is the emotional aspect of repentance, and produces the change in purpose and conduct.

A conviction of sin is implied in repentance. This is the work of the Spirit of God and is included in spiritual awakening. It is not repentance, though it may lead to repentance. Many persons feel special conviction of their sins, but never repent. One may have a desire for salvation as a consequence of this spiritual awakening, but if as with the rich young ruler that desire is exceeded by other desires and no forsaking of sin and worldliness takes place that awakening is fruitless.

True repentance includes the confession of sin and a disposition to make whatever restitution may be required to make satisfaction for wrongs done. Confession implies, first, admission to oneself that he is guilty. It is to be made to God, against whom sin has been committed. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins" (John 1:9). Godly sorrow will cause one to pray as did the publican, "God be merciful to me a sinner" (Luke 18:13). Like the prodigal son he will pray, "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight" (Luke 15:21). Regret for sin included in true repentance will lead one to ask the forgiveness of those who have been wronged. Such asking forgiveness of one's fellow men is

taught in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:23, 24). The Scriptures also enjoin restitution. "If the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he had robbed, walk in the statutes of life, without committing iniquity; he shall surely live, he shall not die" (Ezek. 33:15). When Zacchæus met Jesus he promised to restore fourfold to all from whom he may have taken anything wrongfully. Such is the natural result of godly sorrow for sin. In confession and restitution only that which is possible is required in order to salvation. It is not necessary in order to pardon that one first have actually made right his wrongs against his fellow man, but certainly a genuine willingness to do so must precede pardon. Even confession to God in words is not necessary to salvation, though doubtless the attitude of heart implied in confession is essential. Many have been saved without any articulate prayer. Ordinarily such prayer is helpful to one seeking pardon, but certainly it is not requisite to forgiveness.

Similar to the foregoing conditions is that of forgiveness of one's fellow men for their wrongs against him. Because hatred and the desire for revenge are in themselves sinful they are incompatible with an attitude of repentance. Jesus said, "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses" (Matt. 6:14, 15.) Forgiveness does not imply that one approves the sinful deeds of another, nor that one respects him in the same degree as if he had not done the evil; but it does mean that one shall hold no malice, but instead love his enemies.

3. **Obedience.**—In some sense obedience to God is represented in the Scriptures as a necessary condition for salvation. "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only" (Jas. 2:24). The inspired writer here does not reject faith as being necessary to salvation, but he does include works as being equally necessary with faith. From a superficial comparison of this with the epistles of Paul it has sometimes been supposed that the writings of James and Paul were contradictory to each other. Paul said, "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law" (Rom. 3:28). A more careful comparison of these two passages shows there is no real contradiction. The context in both epistles

throws much light on the meaning of the particular verses quoted. Paul is here opposing those Judaizing teachers who denied the possibility of free pardon of sin through faith and added the requirement of keeping the rites of the law of Moses. James seeks to correct the error of antinomian believers, who assumed that if they merely accepted and believed theoretically in Christ as the Messiah they would be saved regardless of how much sin they might afterward commit. Therefore they were discussing faith in different senses. Paul wrote of saving faith —self-committal or trust in the mercy of God. James had in mind mere intellectual assent. This is clear from verse 19, "The devils also believe, and tremble." It is also evident that they use the term "justification" in different senses. Paul is teaching concerning the present judicial act of God by which men are now pardoned of the penalty of sin. James has special reference to that escape from penalty in the day of judgment.

Doubtless this is the true sense in which obedience is a condition of salvation. After one is pardoned through divine grace he must obey God to the extent of the light he has, else he can not remain justified. Saving faith is inclusive of repentance and repentance includes a purpose to obey God. Therefore repentance and obedience are but secondary conditions of salvation and are implied in faith, which is *the condition* for salvation.

Chapter IV

NATURE OF SALVATION

Having shown the ground on which salvation is possible and the conditions on which it may be appropriated by the individual, next in order we take up an analysis of the work of salvation. What is comprehended in the work of salvation of the individual sinner? Evidently the initial work of salvation must overcome sin as to its penalty and ruling power. In its objective aspect it must effect remission of penalty and peace with God. In its subjective phase it must give power over the ruling power of sin. It must restore one to the condition of sonship in relation to God. And it must give the knowledge of salvation to him who is thus saved.

I. Justification

1. **Sense of the Term.**—The primary meaning of the term rendered justification in our New Testament is the acquittal of an accused person by a judicial decision. In its New Testament usage the term has a twofold signification. In its original usage it meant acquittal as when one who has been charged with a crime is declared by his judge to be innocent of the crime in the sense that he has not committed it. Scriptural examples of such a sense of the term are not uncommon. "If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment, that the judges may judge them; then they shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked" (Deut. 25:1). "Wisdom is justified of ["by," A. S. V.] her children" (Matt. 11:19). "Ye are they which justify yourselves before men" (Luke 16:15). "The doers of the law shall be justified" (Rom. 2:13). The "justification" of these texts is a justification on the ground of works, or a pronouncement of uprightness on the basis of character. But it must be evident to every believer in the Bible that such a legal justification of a human being before God can be only hypothetical, never actual. Because all are declared to be sinners, none can be truly pronounced just. In this sense only those can be properly pronounced just who are actually just. Inasmuch as all are sinners, "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified."

A second and more common use of the term in the New

Testament is in the sense of pardon. In this sense the term "justification" retains only a part of its original meaning. It does not signify in this sense that one is innocent of a crime of which he is accused. The person concerned is guilty of the crime with which he is charged. He is confessedly a sinner. His sin has been deliberate and altogether inexcusable. He is justly under sentence of penalty for his evil doings. No justification of such a person is possible in the first described sense of the term. But in some sense God justifies the sinner. The guilty one is either made righteous, or treated as if he were righteous, or both.

Doubtless as to his receiving a new heart in the work of regeneration the sinner is made righteous. But a clear distinction must be made between justification and regeneration. It is true they are effected simultaneously, and the first would be useless without the second. But discriminating thought can not regard them as identical in meaning and nature. The first is objective, the second subjective. The first has to do with our past committed sins, the second with our disposition to sin in the future. We allow that the term "justification" is sometimes used in the Scriptures to include the idea of the new birth. This is true especially in the Epistle to the Romans. But this is only when the writer has in mind the whole work of initial salvation and puts a part for the whole, as is not uncommon in uncritical usage in the same connection by Christians today. The Scriptures frequently mention justification and regeneration separately and sometimes clearly distinguish them as shall be shown in treating of regeneration.

If justification were regarded as a declaration that one is actually righteous in the sense of subjective holiness through regeneration, then it would have nothing to do with the sinner's guilt and actually committed sins of the past. The desert of penalty must still remain to be dealt with. In the evangelical sense justification is a pardon of past sins. It includes the idea of forgiveness and remission of penalty.

2. **Forgiveness and Remission Included.**—The terms "justification" and "pardon" often include both the ideas of forgiveness and remission. They are to be so understood in their evangelical meaning. When a man sins against God two things occur on the part of God. First God is aggrieved or made to feel dis-

pleasure because of the sinner's unfaithfulness, and second as moral ruler God is under the obligation of inflicting just penalty upon him. Therefore justification must include that change in the feelings on God's part which we call forgiveness. This displeasure of God with the sinner and the turning away of it is often represented in the Bible. "Though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away."

But the leading aspect of justification as taught in the Bible is the remission of penalty for sin. To remit sin is to release from the penalty for it. It is an authoritative order of non-execution of the penalty on the sinner. It is as if the ruler treats the criminal as if he had done no wrong, by releasing him from the obligation to punishment. When a sin is committed it can never come to pass that it was not committed. The sinner deserves punishment for his sin, and it can never come to pass that he does not deserve punishment. The fact of his desert can not be changed. Therefore to remit sin can mean only that through the suffering of Christ the punishment due the sinner is withheld. Then remission of sins is the authoritative order of non-execution of penalty. Justification in the sense of remission of penalty is a change of legal standing and not of one's interior moral state. That change of heart is called regeneration, and is entirely different in its nature from justification. When a civil ruler pardons a criminal no change is made in his inner character, but only in his amenability to penalty. So is the pardon of a sinner through faith in Christ.

3. **The Basis for Justification.**—The atonement of Christ is the only ground on which God can properly remit the penalty due sinners. This has been fully discussed in a preceding chapter on that subject. But different theories have been widely held as to the immediate ground for justification of the sinner.

Those who deny an objective element in the atonement, including Socinians, Unitarians, and Universalists, necessarily hold an unbiblical ground of pardon of sin. Some of them deny the actuality of pardon, affirming that under a perfect government the penalty for violation of law must be inflicted on the violator. These assume the penalty to be trifling and that after it is endured blessedness follows for all men. Others teach that repentance is a sufficient ground for remission of penalty, that when a sinner becomes convinced of the advantage of virtue and

turns to it God no longer regards him as deserving of penalty. Socinus taught justification on the ground of faith, but regarded faith, not as a condition of forgiveness, but as a meritorious work which in itself constituted righteousness. Such justification would evidently be by works. All these theories are so manifestly unscriptural that a mere statement of them is sufficient refutation.

The Calvinistic theory of the basis for justification represents an opposite error from those already described. It affirms that the active obedience of Christ is so imputed to believers that they are as legally righteous as if they had been perfectly obedient to the law of God. In its extreme form it is antinomian. It rests on and is a part of the Calvinistic doctrine of imputation. It admits of no real forgiveness of the individual. When Christ's obedience has been counted or imputed to the sinner as if he had done that obedience, then he is properly regarded as just because he is just. This is the theory in its advanced form. Those whom God declares to be righteous must first be made righteous in fact. In this theory justification is forensic in the strictest sense.

Imputation of righteousness to us in the sense that Christ obeyed the law of God in our stead and we therefore merit the reward of that obedience is not supported by the Scriptures, but is only an assumption of a certain class of theologians. Let us examine some of the texts chiefly relied upon for substantiation of this theory. "He shall be called, the Lord our righteousness" (Jer. 23:6). It is said he shall be called our righteousness because he is our righteousness. Doubtless this is true. But in what sense is he our righteousness? He can be such only in the sense that he is the procurer of our righteousness or justification. "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous" (Rom. 5:19). Here again the words of the text furnish no conclusive proof of Calvinistic imputation. The question is, how does the obedience of Christ make many righteous? In our consideration of modal theories of native depravity, it has already been shown that the first part of this text can not mean many were made sinners by the imputation to them of the guilt of Adam's sin. Through the passive obedience of Christ in suffering the death of the cross we are made righteous. This is

taught in many other texts (John 10:17, 18; Phil. 2:8; Heb. 10:10). Our justification is through the blood of Christ. No reason exists for supposing the text under consideration teaches anything more than that we are justified as a result of Christ's obedience in dying to atone for our sins. Other texts assumed to support the theory under review are equally void of support of it as are those here cited.

One of several valid arguments against the theory that the active obedience of Christ is imputed to us is given here as an example. If by imputation we are righteous because of the active and passive obedience of Christ, two results must follow: (1) That in our justification there is no place for pardon, because it is not possible that both perfect obedience and pardon can be the portion of the same person at one time. (2) That we possess both an active and a passive obedience as a means of our justification, which is twice as much as justice requires. It is absurd to suppose it is required of us both to obey the law of God and also to suffer the penalty for its violation.

The true Scriptural basis for justification is the atonement of Christ. The death of Christ is a declaration of the righteousness of God and of his law in such a sense that when he freely remits the penalty for sin on the condition of faith there is no reflection on his perfect holiness. Justification is pardon and in its primary sense is an order of non-execution of penalty, and also it includes forgiveness. According to the Bible, justification is a real forgiveness of sin.

II. Regeneration

1. **The Doctrine of Regeneration.**—Our treatment of the subject of the initial work of salvation has hitherto been concerned only with justification, which was shown to mean pardon and to include the ideas of peace with God and remission of penalty. But the sinner needs more than this. Pardon of past sins can avail nothing for him unless he is given power to refrain from sinning in the future, or to keep justified. This can take place only by a work of grace in the pardoned sinner which will give him power over the power of sin that has ruled him.

Though regeneration is coincident in time with justification, yet it is in its nature distinct from it. Justification has to do with one's relation to God and his law, regeneration is con-

cerned with the inner character of the one justified. Guilt is the ground for the need of justification, but depravity of the nature is the ground for the need of regeneration. While it is true, as formerly stated, that by using a part for the whole, justification is sometimes made in the Scriptures to include regeneration, yet the latter is frequently mentioned specifically and apart from justification. The Scriptures definitely distinguish between the two. The New Testament represents the Mosaic institutions as types of Christian truth. From Heb. 10:19-22 and other texts it is clear that the sprinkling of the blood and the washing of the sanctuary service are types of the way of salvation, or of the process by which the sinner comes to God. The blood on the brazen altar typifies justification or remission of sin. The washing of the laver typifies regeneration. "He saved us, by the washing ["laver," marg. A. S. V.] of regeneration" (Titus 3:5). In this ancient type the distinction between justification and regeneration is made very evident by the use of separate types which very appropriately represent these spiritual truths.

The Scriptures furnish ample ground for believing in the actuality of such an element in the work of salvation as just described. Because we are dependent upon the Scriptures for our knowledge of the nature of the doctrine, a citation of some of the leading statements of Revelation bearing upon the subject is in order. It is not important that these texts contain the term "regeneration" or its equivalent, but only that they set forth the idea commonly expressed by that term. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Titus 3:5). Regeneration is frequently represented as being a new birth. "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God. . . . Ye must be born again" (John 3:3, 5, 7). "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever" (1 Pet. 1:23).

Regeneration is also represented as receiving a new heart. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean. . . . A new heart also I will give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh" (Ezek. 36:

25, 26). In the next verse God says, "I will . . . *cause* you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them." The idea is also represented as one's becoming new. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new" (2 Cor. 5: 17). Also it is represented as a resurrection. "You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. 2:1). It may also be called conversion. "Repent ye therefore, and be converted" (Acts 3:19). This term itself means merely to turn from one course to another. It may be used in the sense of one's voluntarily turning from sin in repentance, but it may also properly be used to describe that change from a worldly or sinful state to a disposition to holiness which is effected by the Spirit of God. In this sense conversion is identical with regeneration.

Though justification and regeneration are not identical in nature, yet they occur simultaneously. Their distinction in nature does not require any chronological separation. There are these two distinct aspects to the work of initial salvation just as in the second work of grace, which shall be described later, the work of entire sanctification and the baptism by the Holy Spirit are distinct in their nature though coincident in time. For logical thought regeneration follows justification, but in experience it is important that they synchronize because the new birth is necessary to one's keeping justified after he is pardoned. The Scriptures represent them as occurring at the same time and they do so occur in normal Christian experience. They are both obtained by the same act of faith. Probably no proof is possible of their ever occurring at different times if they ever do so take place.

2. **The Ground of the Need of Regeneration.**—The necessity for the new birth has its basis in the fact of moral depravity. Depravity has been shown in our anthropology to be a perversion or derangement of the moral nature. This derangement consists in a weakening of conscience, a perversion of the affections, and in some sense a weakening of the will in moral volitions. Though the extent of depravity varies according as one lives a moral or a vicious life, yet in itself it is native to all in a greater or less degree. In full harmony with a well-known law of life all men inherit a deranged moral nature from their

first parents because of their original transgression. The fact of universal native depravity is not only a proof of Scripture, but is attested by universality of sin because depravity gives a bent to sin.

This tendency to sin is the principal cause of all the sinning of men at the present time. It is so strong that men in their natural condition do not have power to refrain from sinning. In this sense they may be said to be totally depraved. Their experience is vividly described in the seventh chapter of Romans. "To will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not" (v. 18). The Apostle makes a strong argument for justification by faith rather than by works by showing that this indwelling sinful nature excludes the possibility of a natural righteousness. This truth adequately explains that set forth in the third chapter that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (v. 23). In their unregenerate condition it may properly be said of all men, both Jews and Gentiles, "There is none righteous, no, not one" (v. 10). Because of this natural tendency to commit sin which dominates men morally, the justified person must also be regenerated if he is to continue in a justified condition. This necessity of regeneration is in exact harmony with the memorable words of Jesus to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born again." The new birth is necessary in order to obedience to God, and also it is that by which one enters into the kingdom of God. It is an important aspect of salvation from sin and is necessary to the attainment of future blessedness.

There is no ground in either Scripture or reason for the theory that children may be so trained from infancy that they shall grow up in such a state that they need no regeneration. Because they inherit depravity, which is called an evil heart, they need a new heart as truly as do those who have voluntarily committed sin and are guilty. No more reason can be given for the assumption that children can outgrow native depravity than that older persons can so overcome depravity that they will need only pardon for salvation.

While it is true that children, as well as others, all need to be born again, it does not therefore follow that they all need justification. Justification is needed only by those who are guilty of personal sin. It is conceivable that when a child comes to the recognition of moral responsibility, he might, if he has been prop-

erly instructed, seek and obtain a new heart without ever having committed any voluntary sin. Such a person would need no justification, because he could have no guilt, yet he would be regenerated as truly as if he had committed actual transgression. It is further conceivable that he might continue in holiness by virtue of that regeneration and never experience guilt. Only on the Calvinistic theory of inherited guilt and total depravity is such an experience as here described inadmissible.

Some one may object that this is only a possible conception in theory, but is never an actual fact in human experience. Without doubt almost all men fall into sin when they come to moral responsibility and need both pardon and regeneration for salvation. But only the all-knowing God can consistently say there are no exceptions to the general truth that all men actually sin at some time. God has not made such a statement, as shall be shown. Some very devout Christians whose relationship with God is beyond question affirm that they have no knowledge of having wilfully sinned. Must we tell such they have sinned? Or in the religious teaching of children, yet in the state of innocence, must we tell them they should ask God to pardon their sins to be saved when they have no sense of guilt? Why not rather teach them they should seek God for a new heart so they will be able to refrain from falling into sin? Must they be told they must first sin, then repent and obtain pardon in order to salvation? Or must religious teaching concerning themselves in relation to God be withheld until they have first stumbled over the precipice of guilt? *Must* "we do evil that good may come"? Is it necessary that we first sin against and grieve God before we can come into conscious favor with him? "God forbid."

But does every human being at some time commit sin? Doubtless all men both before and after regeneration violate the abstract law of righteousness because of the limitations of ignorance. But such short-comings, mistakes, and unavoidable failures effect no guilt and need no pardon in the evangelical sense. A few texts are sometimes cited as proof that all men without exception have sinned or do sin. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23). This and certain other texts teach that without regeneration holiness is impossible. The Apostle here teaches that none, either Jew or Gentile, have lived righteously in their natural condition. It has no reference to

infants, of whom Jesus said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." This text has no bearing on the point under discussion. Another text reads, "If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us" (1 John 1:10). The vital question here is, does the word "we" refer to each person individually or to mankind as a whole? The latter must be its sense, as shown by its use in verse 8: "If *we* say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves." But "we" here can not be true of Christians, for in the preceding verse the inspired writer states that "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." In this whole passage, then, "we" must mean mankind. The writer is opposing the Gnostic heresy which referred all sin to the body and held that the soul had no sin and did not sin. The text affirms that mankind is actually sinful and has sinned, but that Christ provides a remedy for both. It does not contradict the idea that one may possibly be regenerated before he goes into sin.

3. **Nature and Effects of Regeneration.**—What then is the exact nature of regeneration? We have already stated it effects salvation from the reigning power of sin. It gives one power to triumph over the strong natural tendency to evil resulting from depravity of the moral nature. But this is only the effect of regeneration and is not an answer to the question as to what is the real nature of the work of the new birth. The statements of Scripture relative to regeneration are concerned almost entirely with the effects of it rather than with any psychological or inner moral change that may be effected. And the effects are after all the really important aspect of regeneration.

These effects are by the Bible represented as being caused by an inner change: that change, however, is described in various figures that have much value for practical thought in representing the greatness of the change effected, but they need interpretation if they are to furnish any help in understanding the exact nature of regeneration. If it be asked in what sense our spirits must be born again, it must be admitted that it is certainly not in the sense that they have a beginning of existence or consciousness then. Neither is there a removal or adding of faculties. Evidently a change takes place that is in some respects analogous to physical birth, but it is certainly not analogous to every aspect of natural birth. Likewise under the figure of one's becoming a new creature or being resurrected, the analogy

applies only in certain aspects and might easily be carried too far in an attempt at interpreting them to show the real nature of the change thus described.

Regeneration is in some sense an overcoming of moral depravity, but it is not a complete removal of depravity from one's nature. The Scriptures teach that depravity remains in the regenerated and is entirely cleansed away only in entire sanctification, which is subsequent to regeneration, as shall be shown later. The Scriptures describing regeneration do not describe it as being an entire sanctification from inbred sin. In regeneration one is saved from the *reigning power* of the depraved nature. Justification is salvation from the guilt of sin, regeneration is salvation from the reigning power of sin, and entire sanctification is salvation from the indwelling of sin. Each of these aspects of salvation is distinct in nature. Regeneration is a giving of power to conquer depravity, to deliver from its ruling power. It is the incoming into one's life of the Holy Spirit's working by which one is enabled effectually to volitionate obedience to God. The unregenerated seeker after righteousness of the seventh of Romans is made by the Apostle to say, "To will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not." Regeneration overcomes this effect of depravity by empowering one to perform the good.

To regenerate, then, is first and chiefly to strengthen the will in moral volitions. Assisted by the power of God, the regenerate man is able to triumph over the sinful tendency of the depraved nature and to do what is right. But regeneration is also a change of heart or of the affections. The new birth causes one to love what he once did not love and to cease to love sinful things he once loved. These holy emotions, like the strengthening of the will, are effected by the incoming of the power of the Spirit of God. Doubtless this operation of the divine Spirit extends to the conscience and the whole moral nature in strengthening it in order to obedience. This regenerating work of the Spirit is well described by the apostle Paul as follows: "For the law [power, as is the sense of "law" in Rom. 7:23] of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law [power] of sin and death" (Rom. 8:2).

Though regeneration is always great in its effects and supernatural in character, yet in consciousness all are not equally

aware of the same degree of change. The change effected is more radical in some persons than in others. He who has lived a vicious life and in addition to great natural depravity has acquired strong tendencies to evil because of much indulgence in sinful conduct will, when born again, likely experience a consciousness of radical change in affections, inclinations, and desires. Another person of pious parents who has himself lived a morally upright life may be conscious of much less of inner change when born again. This is at least one reason why very wicked persons often have more definite conversions than do those less depraved. But persons of the latter class may be as truly saved as are those who experience a more radical change.

4. **Possibility of Present Regeneration.**—Not a few professed Christians hold the error of baptismal regeneration. This theory is especially prevalent in the older communions—the Roman, Lutheran, and Anglican. Those who hold this conception of regeneration usually deny the possibility in this life of regeneration in the Biblical sense. Who can suppose that mere water could effect a change in one's moral nature? Baptism is a sign of an interior cleansing, but not its cause. The Scriptures closely connect regeneration with baptism, as they do also remission of sin, but neither is represented as being the result of baptism. Those who deny the supernatural work of the Spirit of God in present regeneration do so in clear contradiction to the Scriptures. It is constantly represented in the Bible as a present experience. "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born . . . of God" (John 1:12, 13). "Being born again . . . by the Word of God" (1 Pet. 1:23). "Every one that doeth righteousness *is* born of him" (1 John 2:29). "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin . . . because he is born of God" (1 John 3:9). "Every one that loveth is born of God" (1 John 4:7). "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God" (1 John 5:1). "Whosoever is born of God sinneth not" (1 John 5:18). These texts clearly show that regeneration is a present experience, that it is obtained by faith, and that it is productive of holiness of life. These texts alone are sufficient refutation of the theory of baptismal regeneration in that they describe the results of regeneration in the Biblical

sense as being far greater than the consequences of baptismal regeneration are known to be.

But another class of modern religious teachers deny the actuality of present regeneration on an entirely different ground. They affirm the Greek word γεννάω (*gennao*) translated "born" in our common English version is more properly rendered "begotten." Then they assume the texts quoted in the preceding paragraph teach that Christians are only begotten of God, that they are in an embryonic state and will be born at the resurrection of the body. But the theory is without Scriptural support and betrays on the part of its supporters a very superficial acquaintance with the use of the Greek term under consideration. We freely admit that the word in its various forms is used of the procreative act of the father, but it is also inclusive of the giving birth to the child by the mother. Dr. William Strong says in his Exhaustive concordance that it means to "bear, beget, be born, bring forth, conceive, be delivered of."

Citations of a few texts will show it is properly understood to mean birth. "And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was *born* Jesus, who is called Christ" (Matt. 1:16). If the form of the Greek word γεννάω, (*gennao*) here translated "born" is referred to Joseph, then the virgin birth must be denied, but this is clearly affirmed in the verses immediately following. If it is referred to Mary, which is evidently the meaning of the text, then it here means birth as our common translation renders it. "Now when Jesus was *born* in Bethlehem of Judea" (Matt. 2:1). Here the word must refer to the bringing forth of Jesus by Mary, for it is clear he was conceived of the Holy Ghost in Nazareth and not in Bethlehem (Luke 1:26). "Among them that are *born* of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist" (Matt. 11:11). "As soon as she is delivered of the child, she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is *born* into the world" (John 16:21). In neither of these texts can the Greek term mean other than the actual bringing forth of the child by the mother. When by this term Christians are said to be born of God and consequently to be children of God it may properly be understood to mean that the new birth is now actual. That the

original word means they are now only in an embryonic state is, to say the least, an unscholarly assumption.

III. Sonship

1. **Children of God.**—As a result of, and at the time of, justification and regeneration men become children of God. This relationship is often referred to in the Scriptures as being a blessed condition of the saved. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God" (Rom. 8:14). "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:26). "Because ye are sons [of God], God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Gal. 4:6). "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God" (Eph. 2:19). "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God. . . . Now are we the sons of God" (1 John 3:1, 2). All men are children of God by creation, but the sonship here described is that relationship resulting from faith in Christ.

2. **Sonship by Adoption.**—Under the Roman law adoption was by formal purchase with money in the presence of witnesses of the child by the one who adopted him. The child thus adopted entered into the family of his new father as heir equal with any other natural sons the father might have. The Apostle probably had in mind this custom when he wrote: "Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby ye cry, Abba, Father" (Rom. 8:15). "That we might receive the adoption of sons" (Gal. 4:5). Under this relationship men are represented as having been alien from God. Because of sin and rebellion they are separated from God and out of filial relation with him, deserving of wrath rather than favor. When by the grace of God through Christ they are forgiven and their penalty is remitted, when they again become heirs to the inheritance of God's blessings, when God can consistently show his love for them in gracious benefits, then they may well be represented as having been adopted as the children of God. In this aspect sonship has its principal ground in justification.

3. **Sonship by Birth.**—A larger basis of sonship is found in the fact of regeneration. Those who are born of God are mem-

bers of his family and his children. "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born . . . of God" (John 1:12, 13). Here sonship is evidently the result of being born of God. Believers are children of God in the sense that they are of like nature with him by having his Spirit. The reason why those born of God do not commit sin, says the apostle John, is because "his seed remaineth in him: and he can not sin, because he is born of God" (1 John 3:9). As children of earthly parents are of like nature as their parents, so the regenerate person has a holy nature like God his father.

IV. Consciousness or Assurance of Salvation

1. **Fact of Assurance.**—No knowledge is of such vast importance to the individual as that he is personally accepted of God, that his sins have been pardoned, that God looks upon him with pleasure, that he is born of the Spirit, that he is a child of God, and that he is on the way to eternal blessedness. It is reasonable to suppose those who are thus saved are conscious of their salvation. The infinite cost of salvation is ground for the expectation that God will give definite assurance of acceptance to those whom he saves. He so loved men that he spared not his own Son; that he sent his Holy Spirit to convict, convert, sanctify, and guide them; that he inspired holy men to write the sacred Scriptures for the revelation of the way of salvation; that he calls, qualifies and sends ministers to preach salvation to sinners; and that he instituted his church as a means for the propagation of the gospel. Surely after doing all this he has not failed to make possible to the individual Christian the knowledge of that most important fact—that he is a child of God.

If assurance of one's individual acceptance by God is not possible, then the most devout are of all men most miserable. If one is fully awakened to the awfulness of his sin against God, if he is truly sorry for his sin and deeply penitent, if he sincerely hungers after the peace and love of God, if he earnestly seeks to make sure of blessedness beyond this life—it would be a sad condition indeed if he must ever struggle throughout life in uncertainty as to whether he is a child of God or a child of the devil, whether he is saved or lost.

But thank God, assurance of acceptance with God is possible. It is, not only an inference from reason, but also a clear truth of

the Scriptures that we may know we are saved. "We know that we have passed from death unto life" (1 John 3:14). "We know that we are of God" (1 John 5:19). "We are of God" (1 John 4:6). "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (2 Cor. 5:1). Such certainty of personal salvation is frequently represented in the Bible.

2. **Nature of Assurance.**—More general agreement exists among Christians as to the possibility of assurance than concerning its exact nature. Actual experience of it by the individual is more important to him than is his belief concerning its source, mode, or nature. Yet a proper comprehension of the nature of it is important to protect one against doubt and confusion.

Those who hold the doctrine of unconditional election of individuals to eternal blessedness hold also a theory of assurance in harmony with that doctrine. With them assurance consists in some individuals being so highly favored of God as to be assured that they are eternally elected to certain future blessedness. Such a view of assurance is without Scriptural support as truly as is the system with which it is connected. The assurance for which we contend is a consciousness of present acceptance with God, which will result in future blessedness if one is loyal to the truth. This assurance may be with some a strong, unwavering conviction of their adoption. With others it is less definite, but yet a comfortable persuasion, though it may be accompanied at times with temporary doubts. Assurance may grow stronger with the lapse of time as one has longer experience in the Christian life with the accompanying evidences that God is with him.

The sources of assurance are two—the witness of the Spirit of God and the witness of one's own spirit. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16). No text in the Bible is clearer than is this one concerning the sources of assurance of sonship. According to it there are two distinct witnesses to our salvation. This does not mean there are two subjective assurances. Many witnesses may all testify to a single truth. The witness of the Holy Spirit is sometimes denied as being distinct from the witness of one's

own spirit. The original word, συμμαρτυρέω (*summartureo*), in this text rendered "beareth witness with," is properly translated. It means a joint testifying. "With" implies relation of two or more. Here the Spirit of God witnesses "with" our spirits to the fact of our salvation. It can not properly be understood that he witnesses *to* our spirits. The reading of the common English version of this text has the overwhelming support of critical authorities.

Those who deny there are two witnesses to our salvation usually deny a distinct witness of the personal Spirit of God, regarding the statements of Scripture so interpreted as meaning merely the divinely given disposition to godliness. But in the nature of things there is no reason for denying a distinct witness of the Spirit. Throughout the Scriptures the Holy Spirit is represented as witnessing to other truths. Why might he not also testify directly to the believer that he is accepted of God? But if the text under consideration does not teach there are two witnesses, then it does not teach the witness of one's own spirit. It must then read, "The Spirit itself beareth witness *to* our spirit." With such a rendering it makes the Holy Spirit the only source of assurance and our spirit the recipient of its testimony. Yet even such an improper rendering of this text would not exclude the truth of a witness by our own spirit as taught in other texts.

3. **Witness of God's Spirit.**—The fact of the witness of the Spirit is clear both in the Scriptures and in the experience of many Christians. It is a direct testimony to our adoption of God. As it is distinct from the witness of our own spirits, as has been shown, it is therefore a direct witness. If as some have assumed his only witness were through the work of regeneration which he accomplishes, then it would be identical with the witness of one's own spirit, and we would have but the one witness to our sonship. But we have already shown that the Bible teaches two distinct witnesses.

The mode of the Spirit's witnessing is by a direct operation within the mind of the Christian by which he possesses a conviction that he is accepted of God. Normally there is no manifestation apart from that conviction which he effects. There is no audible voice, nor even an inner voice. His witness is not so much a communication *to* the mind, as an effect *in* the mind.

He is not limited to natural modes of communication of thought. He has no need of employing human language, audible sounds, and our physical auditory organs, the ears. He causes the knowledge which he desires us to possess to arise in our consciousness immediately. Knowledge thus obtained is more certain than if it reached us through the natural channels of communication, unless communications of the latter class be accompanied by certain evidence that they are from God.

The exact mode of the Spirit's witness is inscrutable to us. But the mystery of the manner of his testimony has no weight against the reality of it. We believe many things that are mysterious. Thought itself is an insoluble mystery for us, yet we know we think. Not only is the witness of the Spirit mysterious in its mode, but also the Spirit's work of regeneration is mysterious. Yet as we are cognizant of the fact of regeneration in us, so are we also of the witness of the Spirit.

This witness may be illustrated in a measure by the testimony or communication of the divine Spirit concerning other facts. As he testifies to believers that they are children of God, so in a similar manner he testifies to the unconverted that they are sinners. This is commonly called conviction. Jesus said the Spirit would "convince the world of sin." Conviction of sin may result from other than the direct operation of the Holy Spirit, as from the preaching of the Word of God or one's own reasoning. Imminent danger may be the occasion for such conviction. But apart from all this it is evident that when no such circumstances are present to awaken the sinner the Holy Spirit sometimes directly effects deep conviction of sin and awakening to its awfulness. Many persons have distinctly cognized this testimony of the Spirit to their sinfulness who have not known it so distinctly in witness to their salvation. He also witnesses in a similar manner to other truths in experience. Not infrequently persons who have prayed for physical healing of disease have suddenly found themselves in possession of a settled conviction that they would be cured, even before any physical change was felt and when they were not engaged in prayer nor exercising active faith. Special direction by the Spirit of God may be by this same general method of his working in our minds to effect that knowledge he wills we have.

In the experience of some, the witness of the Spirit may be

recognized as being directly from him. Others have a settled conviction that they are children of God, the fruits of the Spirit appear in their lives, and those who know them best have full confidence in their being truly converted, but these persons have no knowledge that they have ever had the witness of the Spirit. In other words, many devout believers receive the witness of the Spirit and the assurance it gives, without being aware that it is from him. Probably this is true of the experience of most believers. But inasmuch as the assurance is the important thing rather than the mode by which it is received, the absence of clear cognition of the cause of it is not improper.

4. **Witness of Our Spirit.**—The second ground of assurance mentioned by the apostle Paul is the testimony of our own Spirit. "The Spirit itself beareth witness *with our spirit,* that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16). This witness is not represented as being inferior to the witness of the Spirit of God as a ground of assurance. It is indirect, while the latter is direct. Though it is indirect it is not therefore any less divine than is the direct divine witness, nor a less valid ground of assurance. In this witness of our own spirit we compare the facts of our religious experience with the facts of the Bible. The agreement of our experience with the Scripture representations of what constitutes Christian experience furnishes evidence that one is a Christian. The witness of our own spirits really includes a logical process. It is so even though ordinarily we may not be conscious of such a process. Usually the one seeking salvation expects certain fruits of conversion, and when they are experienced his mind leaps to the conclusion that he is a child of God, without any consciousness of a process of reasoning.

Specific aspects of Christian experience illustrate this ground of assurance. When the penitent sinner has in living faith committed himself to the mercy of God, he may suddenly become aware of a new and warm love for God such as he has never felt before. When he remembers that "every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God" (1 John 4:7), he has ground for assurance that God has given him a new heart. Or he may come to realize a freedom from guilt and from the burden of his sins and instead a new sense of peace and joy. When he compares this experience with the statement, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God" (Rom. 5:1), he

again has ground for believing he is a Christian. The apostle John writes, "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren" (1 John 3:14). The love of Christians for one another is a prominent characteristic of them. If one finds when he believes on Christ that his heart is especially attracted to other Christians so that he loves them as he has not loved them before, he knows, as did the inspired writer, that he has passed from death unto life.

If he finds himself possessed of an inclination to please God because of unselfish love for him, if he discovers he has new desires and appetites, if he finds the various fruits of the Spirit in his life, he may properly reason that he is a new creature.

5. **Assurance in Relation to Doubts.**—The witnessing to sonship either by the divine Spirit or by one's own spirit is not limited to that initial testimony given at the time of conversion. These assurances continue to be received from time to time by the saved person. In the classical text on assurance, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God," it is represented as a present experience of those already saved, and there is no hint that such testimony ceases with the witness received at conversion. But this special witness is not continuous or constant. It is experienced at irregular intervals. At times other than these periods of special assurance the Christian is liable to be attacked with doubts. These doubts are usually the result of one's holding the false assumption that one must always be conscious of ecstatic emotions or other experiences which he has had at a previous time and which then were ground for assurance.

In the absence of special assurance from the Holy Spirit and when doubts assail, the witness of one's own spirit may yet form a sure ground of assurance. Even if one is not at the particular time conscious of any special emotions of love, joy, or peace he may yet properly rest his confidence on the experiences of the past. But in addition to these as ground for assurance are the promises of God given in the Bible. There salvation is offered on the condition of repentance and faith. When one knows he has sincerely repented of sin and in faith thrown himself on the mercy of God, the promises of God are themselves valid ground for assurance. And the conditions for salvation are such that one may know, if properly instructed,

that he has met them. What can form better ground for assurance of salvation than the immutable Word of God?

Nowhere in the Bible are men told to seek for the particular witness of the Spirit. No instance is given of seekers for salvation tarrying for a witness. Jesus and the apostles exhorted men and women to believe. It is not for the seeker to concern himself particularly about the witness of the Spirit. That is God's business, and he will attend to it in his own time and manner. It is the sinner's duty to repent and believe and in doing this he will at least have the evidence of the Word of God that he is forgiven. This is sufficient to stand upon. God will give any other witness he may please. The witness does not save; therefore is not requisite to one's salvation. The witness of the Spirit is an added blessing. Repentance and faith are not of themselves the ground for assurance of salvation, but are conditions for it. But when those conditions have been met the divine promise becomes a ground of assurance. This is another example of the witness of our own spirits.

Assurance varies greatly in degree in different individuals and in the same person at different times. This variability is due to several causes. Personal temperament is a determining factor. Some are naturally mild and others are intense. Some are given to confidence and hope, while others are timid, doubting, and pessimistic. Also the degree of one's assurance is determined greatly by the depth of his own spiritual life. If he is thoroughly devoted to the will of God he is more likely to have strong assurance than if he is wavering and lacking in consecration. Again, the witness of the Spirit may correspond in intensity with that of our own spirit, and if one has not been greatly depraved by sin before conversion he will necessarily be conscious of a less radical change in certain respects in regeneration than will one more depraved. Such persons are not therefore less assured of salvation than he who has been more sinful, because of other determining factors which enter in. Finally, God may be pleased to give a less degree of assurance of sonship as a means of testing our faithfulness in serving him. He is pleased to test his people in some manner and the absence of strong assurance may properly be employed as a means if he wills.

V. Holiness of Life

By holiness of life is meant a life free from sinning. It is also called a holy life and a sinless life. All of these designations are correct. Thus far in this chapter we have been concerned with the initial work of salvation. It is this supernatural work of salvation and especially regeneration that makes holiness of life possible. This subject might have been discussed under the heading of regeneration except for the need of emphasis and elaboration due to the prevalence of erroneous views. Few aspects of Christian truth have been more misunderstood and misrepresented than has this.

1. **The Sense of the Scriptures.**—That Christians should and do live lives free from sin is a clear truth of the Scriptures. This truth is declared by the different New Testament writers, and is represented by them in a variety of forms. They disallow sinning in any degree. If one is a Christian he commits no sin; if he sins he is not a Christian. The Bible not only exhorts men to holiness of life, but positively condemns those who do commit sin. No attempt is made here to give an exhaustive array of texts in support of a sinless life by Christians, but the prevalence of the denial of the possibility and necessity of a life of holiness by them is sufficient warrant for the citation of several representative texts on the subject.

It was shown in our anthropology that all men commit sin because of natural depravity. But it was said of Christ, "Thou shalt call his name *Jesus:* for he shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21). This necessarily implies that he would save them from their sinning if his salvation is a complete redemption. Regeneration has already been shown to give reigning power over sin. It is generally admitted that a Christian should not commit any particular sin.

The Bible command is to sin not. When Jesus had healed the impotent man at the Pool of Bethesda he said, "Sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee" (John 5:14). To the woman taken in adultery he said, "Go, and sin no more" (John 8:11). If it had been impossible for them to refrain from sinning such commands would have been unreasonable. Especially cruel and unjust would have been the threat of a worse affliction than the thirty-eight years of impotency if it were impossible for the impotent man to refrain from sinning.

The apostle Paul was as positive as Jesus in unqualifiedly disallowing sin. "Awake to righteousness, and sin not" (1 Cor. 15:34). Peter also taught likewise. "Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps: who did no sin" (1 Pet. 2:21, 22). That Christ did no sin is commonly admitted by Christians. If we follow in his steps we shall likewise do *no* sin. We *should* follow in his steps. He gave us an example of holy living for our imitation. The words of this text constitute a positive requirement of holy living by us. Also the apostle John taught likewise. "These things write I unto you, that ye sin not" (1 John 2:1). Surely this eminent apostle was not trying to accomplish the impossible in his writing. "He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked" (v. 6). Ought implies obligation. But we are not obligated to do the impossible. Therefore, it is possible to live a holy life as did Christ.

The Scriptures teach that those who are regenerated do not commit sin. "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:34, 36). Here Jesus taught that through his power men might be freed from the necessity of committing sin, and that those who do commit sin are servants of sin rather than servants of God. Similar in meaning to these words of Jesus is the teaching of Paul in the sixth chapter of Romans. In the fifth chapter the benefits of justification by faith are described. In the sixth verse of the sixth chapter Paul states that "our old man," the "body of sin," or sinful nature is destroyed "that henceforth we should not serve sin." Because of the power over depravity he says, "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof" (v. 12). "For sin shall not have dominion over you" (v. 14). "Ye *were* the servants of sin. . . . Being then made free (vs. 17, 18). "But now being made free from sin, and become servants of God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life" (v. 22).

The apostle John even more definitely affirms Christians do not sin. "Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not" (1 John 3:6). "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he can not sin, because he is born of God" (v. 9). "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth

not'' (1 John 5:18). These statements are clear. Through the change of heart, called the new birth, men are enabled to refrain from sinning, and those who are born again do refrain from it. It is their disposition to live holy because they have that union with God here represented.

Not only do the Scriptures teach that the regenerated do not sin, but they definitely declare that all who sin are not children of God. ''He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him'' (1 John 2:4). ''Whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him'' (1 John 3:6). ''He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil'' (v. 8). The sense of these texts is unmistakable. Those who commit sin are not Christians. ''In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God'' (v. 10). Here the inspired writer represents holiness of life as the distinguishing mark between Christians and the children of the devil. ''The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world'' (Titus 2:11).

2. **Definitive Sense of Sin.**—A lack of clear definition of terms has often led to controversy and misunderstanding in doctrinal statements. Evidently this is the reason for much of the difference of views regarding the possibility of a sinless life. Some truly devout persons because of past teaching contend that all men sin, and yet there is reason to believe that they themselves keep their own consciences pure. Doubtless their attitude in this is due to a failure on their part clearly to distinguish between sin in the absolute sense and sin in the imputed sense.

By sin in the absolute sense we mean the violation of God's law. For ''sin is the transgression of the law.'' It is in this sense a violation of God's written commandments or of some moral principle, and the right or wrong of an action depends upon its relations to the will of God rather than upon the intention of him who performs it. God's law disallows the making of false statements, yet through lack of knowledge of the facts any one but Omniscience may make a statement that may after-

ward be found to be false. It is always wrong to take that which belongs to another, yet all are liable unknowingly to keep money belonging to another through error in changing money or by failure to remember to pay a debt. Again, because of our human limitations we may fail to feed the starving, to encourage the distressed, to give money for the spreading of the gospel, or to point a lost soul to Christ. If we only knew, we would do better in many of these things. Every man fails in some of these or similar things every day. If sin is to be defined to mean only the violation of the absolute standard of moral right, then without doubt all sin every day. Because of thus regarding these mistakes and failings resulting from human limitations as sin, many true Christians have assumed that they sin more or less every day, while their hearts and motives are pure.

But according to the New Testament this is not the full definition of sin. The Old Testament describes a sin of ignorance, but the New Testament teaches that when there is no law, there is no transgression (Rom. 4:15). In other words, only as one knows he is doing sin against God, does God impute it to him as sin. Reason also agrees with this. It would be unjust to punish one for that which he did unknowingly or for which he is not responsible. Moral principles allow that one is punishable only to the extent he is responsible. His guilt or innocence depends upon his intentions. If he does an act right in itself, whatever may be his motive the natural good results of that act will accrue to him, but his motive will determine the judicial results. Also if one does an act wrong in itself natural evil results follow, whatever was his motive, but the judicial results are determined in the light of his motive. If he was constrained in any way to do the wrong act so it was not by his own choice, or if he did not and could not know it was wrong, then he has not sinned and deserves no punishment. One commits sin only as he acts intelligently and intentionally.

Then a violation of the law through ignorance is not sin in the true or New Testament sense. Moreover, it is improper and confusing to teach that we sin more or less every day because of those unintentional violations of God's law. Neither need one pray for forgiveness of these acts for which he is not responsible. As the term is used in the New Testament, sin is an *intentional* violation of what one understands to be the will of

God. It is absurd to suppose a just God imputes guilt to one for that over which he has no power and therefore for which he is not responsible. This view is in perfect accord with the many injunctions of the Scriptures against sinning.

3. **Causes Leading to a Denial of Holy Living.**—Not a few professed Christians deny the possibility of one's being saved from sinning in this life. Neither do these consist wholly of the careless and hypocritical who would thus excuse their own sinful indulgence, but some apparently devout, earnest Christians seem sincerely to believe, in spite of all the Bible states to the contrary, that all must sin. The prevalence of this theory that all must sin is a result of various causes. Not the least of these is the wrong definition of sin previously discussed.

The theory that Christians commit sin is not a modern one. It has passed down through the centuries from generation to generation and from creed to creed for hundreds of years. It can be traced in church history at least as far back as the early part of the third century. In his church history Williston Walker has referred to worldliness in the church as "a tendency much increased by its rapid growth from heathen converts between 202 and 250. As common Christian practise became less strenuous, however, asceticism grew as the ideal of the more serious. Too much must not be expected of common Christians." As Christianity grew, it became popular, and this popularity resulted in many heathen becoming nominally Christian without the vital power of real Christianity to lift them above sin. Therefore they brought down their doctrinal standard on this point to accord with their experience. They decided that the ordinary Christian should not be expected to refrain from sinning. This view has persisted in the minds of professed Christians and in their creeds until the present time.

Doubtless the doctrine of baptismal regeneration has contributed much to the idea that Christians must commit sin. Men's trust in baptism as a means of regeneration has resulted in their failure to obtain true regeneration of heart by the Holy Spirit. Without the new heart they find themselves powerless to live free from sin. As the prophet has said, "A new heart also will I give you . . . and *cause* you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them" (Ezek. 36:26, 27). A lack of ability to live a sinless life by many who assume

they are Christians, but who are not truly such, has been fruitful of the error that Christians are necessarily subject to committing sin.

But a cause, more important than those already mentioned, for the prevalence of the theory that Christians commit sin, was the erroneous teaching given prominence by Augustine and Calvin that man through Adam's sin is totally depraved and incapable of choosing in moral actions. Another cause is the antinomian theory of a certain class of Calvinists, that Christ obeyed the law of God in our stead and therefore the merit of his obedience is imputed to us so obedience on our part is unnecessary. Such unscriptural teaching was given a large place in Romish theology subsequent to the fourth century, but Augustine has influenced Protestant theology in some respects even more than that of Rome. On the points mentioned Calvinistic theology has been fashioned after that of Augustine. And Calvinistic theology has determined the creeds of most of the older Protestant denominations. Just to the extent that one holds it, he usually holds that Christians can not refrain from sinning. The Calvinistic doctrine has been sufficiently considered in preceding pages.

Still another cause for the denial of the possibility of a holy life by Christians is the misinterpretation of certain texts of Scripture, which are next to be considered.

4. **Objections Considered.**—Objections to the teaching that Christians do not commit sin for the most part have their basis either in the assumption of the truthfulness of certain Calvinistic tenets or in a misinterpretation of certain texts that are supposed to teach that all men sin. The Calvinistic theories involved have been shown to be unscriptural. The Bible is evidently not self-contradictory; therefore the many plain texts already cited which clearly teach that Christians do not sin must not be disregarded by interpreting other texts to the contrary. If these other texts are properly interpreted they will agree with the general tenor of Scripture.

A class of texts often appealed to by objectors to the teaching of a sinless life are those statements which affirm that all men in their unregenerate state commit sin. "There is none righteous, no, not one" (Rom. 3:10). Here the Apostle describes mankind as they are without Christ in their unconverted

state. That it is not a description of the experience of Christians is certain from the fact that in verses 11-18 the same persons are charged with the darkest sins. Also it is said of them, "There is none that seeketh after God. . . . The way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes." We know Christians do seek God, have peace with him, and fear him. In chapter one of this epistle the Apostle shows the Gentiles are naturally sinful. In the second chapter he shows the Jews are likewise sinful by nature. In the third chapter he says, "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin" (v. 9). Then he quotes the words "There is none righteous, no, not one." He reiterates the same truth in verse 23, "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." The great truth here affirmed is that all men in their unsaved condition are naturally given to sinning, whether they be Jews or Gentiles. This is clear from the context. Another text, "There is none good but one, that is, God" (Matt. 19:17), is likewise an affirmation that man is good only as God makes him good. It is said of Barnabas that he was a "good man" (Acts 11:24).

Another class of texts cited by objectors are those which declare none lived without sinning in the period preceding the coming of Christ. Examples are as follows: "There is no man that sinneth not" (1 Kings 8:46). "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not" (Eccl. 7:20). These texts were true of men in Solomon's day when they were given. But they were written a thousand years before it was said of Jesus by the angel, "He shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21). Long after the death of Solomon the prophet Ezekiel, looking forward to the coming of Christ, spoke the word of the Lord as follows: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you. . . . A new heart also will I give you . . . and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them" (Ezek. 36:25-27). When Christ came he began to teach the new birth and men began to experience it. Consequently they were able to live sinless lives, as is so often declared in the first epistle of John. But especially could none live sinless under the Mosaic law because of the sin of ignorance, of which the New Testament knows nothing.

A few other texts are sometimes quoted in support of the

theory that Christians can not live without sinning. Rom. 7: 14-25, "The evil which I would not, that I do" (v. 19), is pointed to as the experience of the apostle Paul and therefore it is reasoned that we can not hope to live a better life than the one there described. That this was Paul's experience when seeking righteousness by the works of the law before his conversion is evident from the context. In preceding chapters he seeks to show justification is only by faith. Here he shows it can not be by one's own works, because of indwelling sin. But in the sixth chapter he tells us that those justified by faith are no longer the servants of sin, but are made free from it. In the eighth chapter also, especially in verse 2, he tells of deliverance from the bondage to sinning. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." It was the law of sin that caused Paul to do what he would not do before regenerated. When the Spirit of life came into his heart he was freed from the power of sin so he no longer was compelled to sin. That he did not sin after conversion is certain from his own words. "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how *holily* and justly and unblameably we behaved ourselves among you that believe" (1 Thess. 2:10).

Another text of the objector is a part of the prayer which Jesus gave to his disciples as a model for their praying. It reads, "Forgive us our sins" (Luke 11:4). If one has sinned it is proper that he should ask forgiveness. Before the kingdom of God was set up it was important that believers should pray, "Thy kingdom come." But as when Christ's kingdom had been established further prayer for its coming in this sense was superfluous, so when one's sins have been pardoned he no longer needs to pray, "Forgive us our sins." Jesus said, "After this manner therefore pray ye" (Matt. 6:9). This prayer was given as an example of the acceptable and edifying kind of prayer. It is excellent as a model of prayer, but is not intended for exact repetition by all Christians. Therefore it does not give any support to the theory that all Christians commit sin every day.

Our contention is not that believers can not sin if they choose to do so. Certainly if they do not stedfastly resist temptation they may commit sin, but it is equally true that "he that is born of God sinneth not."

CHAPTER V

ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION

Justification and regeneration have been represented in the preceding chapter as constituting the initial work of salvation. We now come to consider another aspect of salvation which is distinctly set forth and promised by the Scriptures as a complete sanctification.

I. Sense of Sanctification

1. **Other Designating Terms.**—The term most commonly employed to designate this second cleansing is sanctification. This usage has support in the Scriptures. Other designating terms often used for the same idea are holiness, Christian perfection, Christian purity, perfect love, and the higher Christian life. None of these terms adequately express the idea they are used to represent. Probably the phrase "entire sanctification" is the most exact designation of the doctrine and has Biblical grounds for its usage in the words of the apostle Paul, "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly" (1 Thess. 5:23). But inasmuch as no term has the specific meaning of this doctrine in the Scriptures the particular designation to be used is optional with the individual.

2. **No One Specific Scriptural Sense.**—Though the particular truth under consideration is of more importance than any designating term by which it is expressed, yet confusion as to the sense of the term "sanctification" has often led to erroneous views concerning the doctrine. Our English word "sanctify" is from the Greek verb ἁγιάζω (*hagiazo*). The adjective form of the word, ἅγιος (*hagios*), is properly translated "sanctified, holy, pure, chaste, hallowed, or consecrated." Sanctification, then, means primarily to cleanse, and also includes the idea of consecration. Therefore all cleansing in order to holiness, whether that cleansing be of the heart or of the life, spiritual or physical, of committed sins or of depravity of the nature, actual or ceremonial, is properly described as sanctification. It is doubtful whether the term has any specific or technical usage in the Bible as it has come to have in the minds of not a few people. Being a general term meaning to make clean or holy, it is used of various aspects of cleansing in the Bible.

The term "sanctification" is capable of being used in at least eight different senses in respect to experience or practise, and is used in most of these senses in the Bible. It may be used in at least four senses of the purification of the heart: (1) Of sanctification of the heart generally distinguishing as to the particular aspect of cleansing—Acts 20:32; 26:18; Rom. 15:16; 1 Cor. 1:2; 6:11; Heb. 2:11; 13:12; Jude 1. (2) Of justification as a sanctification or cleansing from committed sins —Rev. 1:5; 1 John 1:7, 9; Heb. 9:14; 1:3. (3) Of regeneration, or the removal of or cleansing from the stony heart and the giving of the new heart—Ezek. 36:25-27. (4) Of entire sanctification—John 17:17; Eph. 5:26; 1 Thess. 5:23. In all the foregoing senses sanctification is effected by God. Sanctification may be also used in four other senses, in all of which it is applied to works performed by man: (1) Of sanctification of the outward life—1 Thess. 4:7; 2 Tim. 2:19-21; 1 Pet. 1:14-16. (2) Of reverence, or sanctification by ascribing holiness to a person or thing—Num. 20:12; 1 Pet. 3:15. (3) Of consecration, or sanctification by setting apart—Deut. 5:12; John 17:19; 10:36. (4) Of ceremonial and physical sanctification—Exod. 19:23; 1 Cor. 7:14; 1 Tim. 4:5.

3. **Its Sense as Here Used.**—As it is used in this chapter, sanctification is a purification of men's hearts from depravity subsequently to regeneration. It is not assumed that this is the only Biblical meaning of the term, but it is enough that Jesus and Paul should have so used it (John 17:17; 1 Thess. 5:23). This is the most common designation of the doctrine of a definite cleansing after regeneration by its most learned and eminent advocates, such as John Wesley, John Fletcher, Adam Clarke, George Fox, Richard Watson, D. S. Warner, John Miley, Minor Raymond, Bishop Foster, and A. B. Simpson.

II. Need of a Second Cleansing

1. **Depravity a Ground for Twofold Cleansing.**—The fact of two forms of sin makes room for the possibility of two distinct cleansings from sin. In describing the nature of man resulting from the sin of Adam, it has been previously shown that he has a perverted moral nature. As a result of that derangement men also sin individually and are guilty. They have a double need. They need pardon of their own sins and restoration of their

natures from the depraved condition. They need justification from guilt and sanctification of their natures. They need to be brought into right relations with God and have right character effected in themselves. It does not necessarily follow that these two forms of sin in men must be overcome at two different times, but it is certain that their distinct nature and existence does positively show the possibility of two separate cleansings. If, as the Socinian affirms, men were not depraved, then we should rightly reason there is no possibility of a definite cleansing subsequent to pardon. The first cleansing is not an imperfect work that must be finished in a subsequent effort, but both cleansings, justification and sanctification, are complete cleansings of that aspect of sin which they affect.

2. **Depravity in the Regenerated.**—The doctrine of sanctification as a second cleansing rests upon the idea that depravity remains either in whole or in part in those who have been truly regenerated. If it could be shown that regeneration accomplishes a complete restoration of the moral nature from its depraved condition in such a sense that no sinful tendency remains, then there could be no place for a second cleansing. But it is not here assumed that the proof of remaining depravity in believers is necessarily proof that that depravity may be removed in this life by a second operation of divine grace. Many who affirm the incompleteness of the cleansing from depravity in regeneration emphatically deny the possibility of one's being fully delivered from its power before the hour of death.

But, on the other hand, we need not suppose that the impossibility of entire sanctification is proved by the incompleteness or lack of it in regeneration. He who made man holy at the first is well able to effect cleansing from any moral depravity he has acquired. God wills to save men from all sin. Christ "gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity," that we might be "pure even as he is pure." Therefore with the proof that the regenerate person has depravity remaining in him, there is reason to believe he may have it cleansed away. If it is not so, Christ has failed to accomplish the complete redemption from sin which he intended to accomplish.

That depravity is not entirely cleansed away in regeneration has been the belief of most Christians. It has been said by

Dr. Miley that "the opposing doctrine of entire sanctification in regeneration was new with Zinzendorf and wholly unknown before him." The doctrine of remaining depravity in the regenerate may properly be regarded as generally accepted. The prevalence of this belief is well shown by its statement in many of the church creeds. The Anglican creed reads, "And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated." Also the Westminster creed states, "This corruption of nature, during this life, doth remain in them that are regenerated." Doubtless the statements of these creeds and the common view of Christians on this subject are to be attributed in some measure to the prevalence of the idea of baptismal regeneration, and of a degenerate form of regeneration. But when we remember that multitudes of the most devout Christians truly regenerated and in nowise committed to those creeds which affirm depravity in believers, and altogether independent of traditional theology, have still stedfastly believed on the ground of Scripture and of their own inner experience that cleansing from depravity is not complete in regeneration, it is unwise hastily to decide the doctrine is untrue.

Thousands of these same devout believers have testified that subsequently to their regeneration they were definitely cleansed from that remaining depravity by a second work of grace. The testimony of such persons has much value as corroboration of the Scripture teaching on this subject. But whatever value Christian experience may have it can not properly be regarded as a ground for doctrine when standing alone. This is chiefly due to its misinterpretation and variability in different individuals. It is known that some persons when regenerated are conscious of but little of the movings of depravity in themselves. But this may be explained as due to the variability of the degree of depravity in the regenerate. If through the virtuous living of one's ancestors or even through his own self-restraint one is not greatly deranged in his moral nature he will probably not notice so radical a change in his conversion, nor will he experience the same degree of manifestations of the remaining depravity after regeneration as will one more depraved. Yet the testimony of the many genuinely regenerated persons who have been conscious of remaining depravity after conversion is still valuable as corroboration of the Bible teaching on the subject.

What proof then do the Scriptures afford of remaining depravity in Christians? The doctrine is not directly stated in the Bible, but is rather a general assumption which is to be found in many places. The lack of a direct Scriptural statement of the doctrine, however, is no argument against its validity. Some doctrines, such as the new birth or justification by faith, are definitely and formally stated in the Bible. Others equally important and fundamental to religion are constantly assumed, but nowhere formally stated. The truths of theism, of the divine Trinity, and of moral depravity are examples of those not formally stated. The Bible does not ordinarily set forth truth formally, but rather incidentally. Formal statements of truth were made by the inspired writers only as the immediate occasion required.

The fact of depravity in believers is implied in all those declarations of Scripture which teach a cleansing of the heart subsequently to regeneration. In John 15:1-6 under the figure of the purging of branches of a vine, Jesus describes a cleansing or purging of those who have been converted. A purging of believers implies something in them from which to be purged, and inasmuch as believers are already cleansed from committed sins and regenerated as a consequence of their believing, the purging here described must be a second cleansing. The Father is represented as the husbandman, Christ the vine, and men (v. 6), or his disciples (v. 5), branches of the vine. They are said to be "in" Christ (v. 2); and "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature" (2 Cor. 5:17), or has been regenerated. This is certain. They are not, as some have wrongly supposed, merely justified and not regenerated. This is evident, not only from the last-mentioned text, but also because to be in Christ is to be in his church or kingdom, which is possible only through the new birth, for "except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3). The person described in the text under consideration is also one who bears fruits, which according to Gal. 5:19-24 is possible only to the regenerated. Sinners bear the fruits of the flesh, but these branches joined to Christ do not bear sinful fruit.

Purge as used in this text means to cleanse. The original word, καθαίρω (*kathairo*), means, according to the very best Greek authorities, "to cleanse," and when used metaphorically,

"to cleanse from sin." The idea that it is a cleansing of the outward life instead of the heart is erroneous for the reason that the Scriptures constantly enjoin upon men this cleansing of the life; it is not done by God. It has been shown already that the cleansing done by God is a purification of the heart, but that men are exhorted to cleanse their conduct themselves (1 Pet. 1:14-16). It is a mistake to suppose this is a mere outward cleansing because it is represented by the purging of a vine. It is only an example of the inadequacy of natural figures perfectly to illustrate spiritual truths. Had there been an inner cleansing of a vine, Jesus would doubtless have used that instead of "purge" to represent this cleansing to be accomplished in believers that their fruitfulness might be increased. That this inner cleansing is referred to is also evident from other parts of Jesus' discourse and prayer recorded in John 14-17, of which this vine figure is a part. It agrees with the prayer for their sanctification (John 17:17) that they might be kept from the evil of the world. It also agrees with the promise of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the sanctifier. Discussion of other texts which imply sin in the regenerated by teaching a cleansing of believers is deferred until later. A need of a second cleansing is to be found, then, in the fact of depravity in the regenerated, which is frequently implied in the Scriptures, and is corroborated by the testimony of many intelligent and devout Christians of the consciousness of remaining depravity after regeneration.

3. **Distinction Between Regeneration and Sanctification.**—The foregoing argument for depravity in the regenerated naturally gives rise to the question, if regeneration is not a removal of the depravity of the nature what is accomplished in it? How is it to be distinguished from entire sanctification? Regeneration has been defined in a measure already in making a distinction between it and justification. Justification was then shown to be an effecting of right relations between the sinner and God. Regeneration was shown to be the incoming of the power of the Spirit of God giving power over the reigning power of depravity. It is entirely different from justification in its nature, though they are simultaneous. Though both regeneration and entire sanctification have to do with the practical overcoming of depravity, yet they also are different in their nature. "Jus-

tification is salvation from the guilt of sin, regeneration is salvation from the reigning power of sin, and sanctification is salvation from the indwelling of sin."

The difficulty of showing the difference between regeneration and sanctification is the difficulty of accurately and fully defining either. This latter difficulty is due to the impossibility of describing exactly the nature of depravity. Like other spiritual truths it can not be described in terms of the physical. All expressions concerning depravity, such as remnants or roots, and washing or eradication, are but figurative expressions and should not be allowed to obscure thought as to the literal facts involved in regeneration and sanctification. For practical purposes the distinction between regeneration and sanctification may be described as follows: Regeneration is a suppression of depravity by the power of the Spirit of God coming into one's life, but entire sanctification is the eradication or removal of that depravity from the nature. The work of regeneration is well expressed by Paul in these words, "For the law [power, as is the sense of "law" in Rom. 7:23] of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law [power] of sin and death" (Rom. 8:2). Because of its effects in the life, being regenerated may be properly described as it is in the Bible, as becoming "a new creature," or receiving "a new heart."

That regeneration should be what is here described is reasonable. It would be useless for God to forgive a sinner if he did not thus bring depravity into subjection to the Spirit of God. Because depravity exists in the regenerate, even though it no longer dominates the life, there is a need for a subsequent cleansing from it. Also it is not unreasonable that depravity should not be entirely removed at the time of the pardon of sin. Because human nature generally is depraved and the one who sins was depraved in infancy before he ever sinned, it is not unreasonable that when he repents he should be pardoned and enabled by the indwelling Spirit of God afterwards to keep from sin, rather than that he should be at once restored to Adamic purity. Because there are two steps down in the fall it is not unreasonable that there should be two steps in salvation.

III. Proofs of a Second Cleansing

What then are the proofs of a cleansing of the hearts of

those who have already been regenerated? Such proofs of a second cleansing are ground both for remaining depravity in believers and for the actuality of a definite and entire cleansing from depravity before the hour of death. Unfortunately for the doctrine of sanctification, some of its supporters, in trying to support it with a multitude of texts, have used many that have no application to the subject. This has resulted in causing some persons who found that these texts do not apply to fall into the error of rejecting the doctrine along with the erroneous proofs of it in spite of sound proofs.

1. **Sanctification for the Converted.**—In the prayer of Christ for his disciples at the close of the last supper, he prayed to the Father, "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth" (John 17:17). The sanctification here desired for the disciples was a cleansing of the heart and not of the life. This is evident from the fact that it was to be done by God and not by themselves. As previously shown, men are exhorted to cleanse their own lives; but the cleansing which God does is always represented as being the purification of the heart. Also this sanctification was in order that they might be kept from evil (v. 15). It was a cause and the holy living was the effect. The mere fact that this sanctification is to be accomplished by the Word is no argument against its being a heart cleansing. We are also regenerated by the word of God (1 Pet. 1:23). As it is said, "Being born again . . . by the word of God," so it is said, "Sanctify them through thy truth."

The cleansing for which Jesus prayed could not have been that of initial salvation. He did not pray for sinners, "the world," but for his disciples. They were already justified. This is evident from various statements found in this same chapter as well as in other texts. They were God's and were obedient to his word (John 17:6); were not of the world (vs. 9, 14, 16); were kept from sin (vs. 11, 12, 15); their names were written in heaven, doubtless, as were those of the Seventy (Luke 10:20); and they had been sent out to preach the gospel. It is certain that they were also regenerated and that this was not the sanctification for which Jesus prayed. The facts already mentioned concerning them are fruits especially of regeneration. It is the new birth that makes men "not of the world," and keeps from sin (Ezek. 36:26, 27). And these were not of the

world and were "kept," were obedient or kept the word of God (John 17:6). Surely these men were born again who were sent to preach the kingdom of God, which one "can not see" except he be born again.

Regeneration is essential to entrance into the kingdom of God (John 3:3). Jesus said before this time, that since the days of John "the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it" (Luke 16:16). Therefore men were being born of God prior to the time of Jesus' prayer. There can be no doubt that the apostles were among those who had been regenerated. That they were is certain from the Scriptures. It is said, "Them that believe on his name . . . were born . . . of God" (John 1:11-13). The disciples had believed, as is shown by the Great Confession (Matt. 16:16). Therefore they were born of God. Still another proof that they were regenerated is the fact that they were in Christ the true vine (John 15:2-4). Therefore they were regenerated, for "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature" (2 Cor. 5:17). This prayer of Jesus for the sanctification of his disciples is proof that there is a cleansing of the heart for the regenerated, for he said, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word" (John 17:20).

2. **Sanctification for the Church.**—In full accord with Jesus' prayer that those who are already converted should be sanctified are the words of Paul that sanctification is for the church, which is composed of only those who are regenerated. "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it [the church] with the washing of water by the word" (Eph. 5:25, 26). Here is described a sanctification, not of sinners, but of the church. That this sanctification is not a consecration, but a cleansing of the heart, and not a purification of life is clear from the fact already shown that the sanctification of men which God effects is always a cleansing of the heart. Men are exhorted to cleanse their own lives, or to be holy.

If the reading of the Revised Version be preferred, the argument for the teaching of a second cleansing by this text is strengthened rather than weakened. "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it; that he might sanctify it, *having cleansed* it." This reading, "having cleansed," is well

supported by the original word καθαρίσας (*katharisas*) the first aorist participle, which denotes the indefinite past tense. According to this reading, the church, which has already been cleansed, is to be sanctified. This second cleansing or sanctification of the *church* is identical with the sanctification which Jesus prayed his *disciples* might have, and also with the purging of the branches in the vine, Christ.

3. **An Entire Sanctification.**—The church at Thessalonica was established by the apostle Paul during his second missionary journey. But very soon he was compelled by persecution to go elsewhere. Not long after his departure he wrote his first epistle to them from Corinth, in the closing part of which he said, "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly [entirely]; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Thess. 5:23). The sanctification here taught is to be done by God; therefore it is a cleansing of the heart rather than of the conduct. Those for whom Paul desired it were not sinners, but a church "in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ (1 Thess. 1:1). They were "brethren" (v. 4); and, judged from the frequent commendations in the epistle, evidently a very spiritual church. Yet they were not wholly sanctified. The implication is that they were pure in some degree or in some sense. Their need for entire sanctification is that they may be kept "blameless," which is identical with the disciples being kept from the evil of the world, in order to which sanctification was important, according to the prayer of Christ.

4. **Coincident with the Holy Spirit Baptism.**—Denial of a definite work of salvation subsequent to conversion implies a rejection, not only of a second cleansing, but also of the baptism of the Holy Spirit after regeneration. In no place in the Bible is the baptism by the Holy Spirit represented as occurring at the time of conversion. When Jesus promised him to the disciples he said of him, "Whom the world can not receive" (John 14:17). It has been previously shown that the apostles were converted before Pentecost, at which time they were all baptized by the Holy Spirit. When Philip preached at Samaria many believed and were baptized. Later when Peter and John at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they went there and laid their hands upon them and the Samar-

itans received the Holy Ghost (Acts 8:5-17). Paul found certain "disciples" at Ephesus who had "believed" (Acts 19:1, 2). Even though he recognized them as believers and disciples, yet he laid his hands upon them and they received the Holy Ghost (v. 6). The apostle Paul himself was converted on the road to Damascus and was there called to preach (Acts 26:18); he prayed (Acts 9:11); he was a "chosen vessel" (v. 15); and soon after was called "Brother Saul" by Ananias (v. 17). It was after all this that he was baptized with the Holy Spirit. Before Peter came to him, Cornelius was said to be a devout man who feared God and prayed always (Acts 10:2). His prayers were heard (v. 4), and he was a "just man" (v. 22). Evidently he was a converted man. Yet when Peter came and preached to him he received the Holy Spirit. In all these instances the baptism of the Holy Spirit was subsequent to conversion.

Peter was called in question for preaching to Cornelius, who was a Gentile. In his defense he said, "God, which knoweth the hearts bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, *purifying their hearts* by faith" (Acts 15:8, 9). The purification of heart to which Peter here refers evidently took place when he visited Cornelius. He states that God gave them the Spirit and purified their hearts. Doubtless that cleansing was that which we here designate sanctification and was subsequent to conversion. But the experience of Cornelius was normal in this respect, for Peter says God did to them "even as he did unto us," the apostles, at Pentecost. Therefore the apostles received a cleansing of heart at Pentecost in harmony with Jesus' prayer for their sanctification in John 17:17.

5. **Two Cleansings in Old Testament Type.**—The Mosaic institutions were types or prophetic similitudes of the great basic truths of Christianity. They did not merely happen to be parallel to, or to illustrate, Christian truth, but were originally given of God for that purpose. It is said of them, "Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ" (Col. 2:17); "Which was a figure for the time then present" (Heb. 9:9); "The example and shadow of heavenly things" (Heb. 8:5); "The figures of the true" (Heb. 9:24); "A shadow of good things to come" (Heb. 10:1). The true work of man's

salvation through Christ was altogether worthy to be foreshown by the symbolic salvation of the Mosaic system.

The tabernacle was typical. As the dwelling-place of God it was typical of the church of Christ, the house of God (Heb. 8:2; 1 Tim. 3:15; Heb. 9:9). But as a means of divine service and a system of sacrifice it was also typical of the work of salvation, or the way by which the sinner comes to God. This is clearly brought out by Heb. 10:19-22. That those sacrifices were typical of the blood of Christ and those ceremonial cleansings of our cleansing is certain and generally admitted by believers in the Bible.

The Tabernacle contained two rooms—the holy place and the holiest place. There were two veils, one at the entrance of each of these rooms. Two altars were placed, one before each of these veils. There were two sprinklings of blood, one on each of these altars. What could better symbolize two distinct cleansings and two degrees in holiness than this twofold presentation of blood before God to give admittance into greater holiness? The first altar typified justification. The washing at the laver typified regeneration, (Titus 3:5), and the blood placed on the golden altar as a sin-offering for those who had already been admitted to the first room because of their symbolic holiness was typical of entire sanctification or a cleansing subsequent to conversion. Then there is here represented two degrees of holiness in the church, which makes possible the sanctification of "the church" as described in Eph. 5:26.

That the second room is typical of sanctification is clear from Heb. 10:19-22: "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having an high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Here the exhortation is to "brethren," those already justified and regenerated, to go "into the holiest" from the holy place where they then were. They were to enter it "by the blood of Jesus." "Having had" (A. S. V.) their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience (justified at the brazen altar), and their bodies washed with pure water (regenerated at the laver), which admitted to the first room,

they were urged to go on into the holiest *by the blood of Jesus.* If it be objected on the ground of Heb. 9:24 that the holiest place was a type of heaven, we reply, then we have here an exhortation to the converted to enter heaven. Such an exhortation would be improper, for at best we can only be ready for heaven, which these already were; actually entering is never voluntary on our part. We can enter only when God wills. We could not enter voluntarily if we chose; therefore if heaven were meant in this particular text the text would be superfluous and absurd. But this text evidently exhorts brethren to enter that which may be entered at once voluntarily, which is true of entire sanctification, but is not true of heaven. Heb. 9:24 is concerned with the act of Christ's mediation, which was typified by the mediatory service of Aaron that took place in the holiest of the tabernacle. It is a service that is here represented, rather than a place. As the typical mediation was in God's presence, so is the true mediation in God's presence, regardless of where God is.

IV. Nature of Entire Sanctification

1. **A Real Experience.**—Any attempt accurately and fully to define sanctification must result in failure. No spiritual or mental operation can be so defined. It does not therefore follow necessarily that it is unreal because not capable of full and logical definition in the present state of human knowledge. It would be as unreasonable to reject its reality because of its mystery as to reject the reality of regeneration on the same ground which is equally indefinable in full. But the Scriptures and experience testify to the reality of both of them. Many other facts which are mysteries and inexplainable to human wisdom as to their nature are commonly believed. Mysteries surround us on every hand in physical nature. Also the mind itself as to its nature as well as to its phenomena is involved in mystery. We know we think, but we do not know how we think. It is as unreasonable to reject sanctification because of its mystery as it would be to deny the reality of depravity itself because of mystery in connection with it. Full knowledge of the nature of sanctification is not necessary to the benefits of the experience, as it is not necessary that one understand his digestive processes to be benefited by the food he eats, or to be

informed concerning the mechanism of a telephone and the nature of electricity in order to have the advantages of communication by that means.

But some truths can be known by experience which can be known in no other way. A man born blind can have no true comprehension of color, even though one may try earnestly to explain it to him. He has nothing in his experience with which to compare it. So also a practical idea of the nature of entire sanctification is possible only to him who has the experience. Also one can know the nature of conversion only by being converted. Yet as many who have been truly converted can not explain regeneration, so many who have been sanctified are unable to define sanctification. As the most satisfactory definition of regeneration is a description of its effects, so the description of the effects of sanctification are of special importance.

2. **Effects of Sanctification.**—A distinction was previously made between depravity and the effect of it, which is a tendency to sin. Now we should distinguish between sanctification and the effects of it. Sanctification may be described as being a cleansing from the depravity of the nature; or to state it more literally, it is a restoration of the nature from its deranged condition. If depravity is largely a perversion of the affections, then sanctification must be principally a restoration of them. The effects of sanctification are the absence of the effects of depravity. That the second cleansing taught in the Scriptures is a restoration from depravity is evident from the fact that this is according to man's need. In the very nature of the case it is impossible that a cleansing of the heart subsequent to justification could be a cleansing from those sins which are already forgiven.

Sanctification does not effect an eradication of any essential qualities of human nature as originally constituted, but only of the evil dispositions resulting from its perversion. When God created man he endowed him with a certain natural pride, commonly known as self-respect, which is very desirable in that it causes one to seek to be agreeable and pleasing to his fellow men. This natural pride is perverted through moral depravity to such an extent that men in their sinful condition desire, not only to be well thought of by their fellows, but to be esteemed more highly than any one else. They come to have an unduly exalted estimation of themselves. This perversion of a natural

and proper disposition is the result of selfishness and is sinful. Sanctification results simply in the restoration to the natural condition where one is free from sinful pride, yet is possessed of a proper self-respect.

A sense of justice is also natural to man as created. Justice is an attribute of God and is essential to a moral being. This sense of justice causes one to feel a natural anger, indignation, or displeasure at an act of injustice. Every good person feels it when he beholds the sight of oppression of the helpless. Jesus felt it and God often felt it with Israel. Depravity results in a derangement of this natural anger so that it becomes vindictive, selfish—it becomes hatred. This leads one to sinful acts. Sanctification does not remove from one that sense of justice nor what is included in it, but does restore it from the depraved condition. Other natural qualities such as acquisitiveness, humor, and the desire for pleasure are deranged through sin, but restored in sanctification.

It is not always possible to distinguish clearly between emotions and manifestations of depravity and of essential human nature. The effects of sanctification are not uniform in all men, partly for the reason that the degree of the depravity is not the same in all. The personal experience of sanctification of no particular person can be cited as an example of what the effects of sanctification will be in all others. Sanctification does not destroy the essential qualities of human nature, does not remove all human imperfections, does not make one infallible, nor save one from the possibility of committing sin. Sanctification is identical with Adamic perfection as to heart purity, but in various other respects Adamic perfection is not attained until glorification at the resurrection. This must be true in regard to the physical and mental natures. It is consistent with human probation under present conditions that we should not in all respects be brought to the condition of man in his original estate in this life.

3. **A Definite Work.**—A question of special importance in determining what is the nature of sanctification is whether it is a definite, instantaneous work of grace or whether it is a gradual growth in holiness, of the nature of growth in grace. What has been said about it in preceding chapters assumes it is a definite, instantaneous purification. The proof that it is a

second cleansing is proof also that it is a definite cleansing. However, it seems important that more formal proof should be given on this point.

The very nature of the work of sanctification, as we have set it forth, is opposed to the idea of gradual cleansing. Evidently there is a growth in grace after conversion that may be called a sanctification of the life, but this is not to be confused with the instantaneous heart cleansing called sanctification. If depravity of the moral nature may be described as being like that in the nature of a lion which causes it to differ from the lamb, then the distinction between a growth into holiness and a definite cleansing of the heart from depravity might well be represented by the difference between taming the ferocious nature of the lion and miraculously converting a lion nature into that of a docile lamb.

Sanctification is accomplished by the blood of Christ as is regeneration. Few would affirm regeneration is a gradual process. The "purging" of John 15:1-6 is a definite work. Its purpose is that those already in Christ and who are bearing the fruit should bear more fruit. According to this statement, holiness of life is the result, not the cause, of holiness of heart. The typical sanctification, the application of the blood on the golden altar, was a definite work, as was also the passing from the holy place to the most holy place of the tabernacle. Also the Scriptures represent some as being already sanctified. Very few, if any, of those who hold sanctification is attained by a process of growth ever believe themselves to have attained the experience. Herein the fruits of their theory differ from the Bible teaching of sanctification.

We do not say that God might not if he so desired and because of special conditions sanctify one by a gradual process, or that he might not wholly sanctify one at the time of justification, but it is clear that such is not the normal method; nor is such taught in the Scriptures, and it is better that we teach what is taught in the Bible than what is not taught there.

V. Attainment of Sanctification

1. **Attainable in This Life.**—For the attainment of sanctification it is of importance that one know it is possible during this life. This point is denied by the creeds of some denominations.

The point to be proved here is not the need of a second work, nor the possibility of entire sanctification, but that sanctification is attainable before the hour of death. That it is attainable during this life is evident from several Scripture statements already cited. Jesus prayed for his disciples that they might be sanctified in order that they might be kept from the evil. Therefore he recognized it as attainable in life. Likewise the apostle Paul prayed for the entire sanctification of the Thessalonians that they might be preserved. Some were sanctified to whom epistles were addressed. Of these the inspired writer said, "He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14).

Sanctification is not only attainable in this life, but its attainment by every believer is important. Jesus prayed for the sanctification of his disciples at the solemn hour when he was ready to go out from the last supper to Gethsemane, betrayal, and death. It was worthy of a chief place in the last prayer for his disciples. The apostles also give it an important place. Paul at once inquired, when he went to Ephesus and found twelve disciples, if they had yet received the Holy Ghost.

2. **Conditions for Sanctification.**—The conditions for sanctification are not formally stated in the Scriptures, but they may be known from incidental statements. They are briefly as follows: The apostles received it by prayer (Acts 2). The Samaritans and the Ephesians by the prayers and laying on of the hands of the others (Acts 8:15, 17; 19:6). A dedication of ourselves is necessary in the very nature of the case, however, to this cleansing and infilling of the Spirit, as in the ceremonial sanctification of the Old Testament. Consecration is important for sanctification, but this is not to be confused with the forsaking of all that Jesus set forth as a requisite to discipleship. It is rather a dedication to be a temple for the Holy Spirit's indwelling.

Too often sanctification is represented as an experience very difficult of attainment, which may be reached only after long praying and seeking, and which many may never be able to attain. The Bible rather represents it as for even the weakest of Christians. As Peter said in his Pentecostal sermon in telling the penitent Jews of the possibility of their receiving the Holy Ghost, "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God

shall call'' (Acts 2:39). The conditions are simple prayer and faith. ''If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?'' (Luke 10:13).

3. **Assurance of Sanctification.**—The evidence of one's being sanctified should not be expected to be experienced by the physical senses. A spiritual work in the moral nature must be known otherwise. To reject the truth of sanctification because it is not attested by the physical senses would be as unreasonable as to reject justification or regeneration for a similar reason. A spiritual operation is properly known spiritually. Assurance of sanctification is like assurance of the initial work of salvation, by the witness of the Holy Spirit and of our own spirit. The Bible does not affirm this of sanctification, but it does teach that these are the witnesses to other spiritual experiences, including the witness to the sin of the unsaved and to the adoption of the converted. The Spirit also similarly made known his will that Paul and Barnabas should go forth from Antioch as missionaries. In the nature of things God's Spirit and our spirit are the witnesses to sanctification. That these are the sources of assurance of sanctification is a fact of experience.

The degree of clearness of the witness of the Spirit of God to sanctification in one's consciousness varies as in the assurance of adoption. Likewise as in the assurance of adoption the witness of our own spirit varies with different persons and for a similar reason. Because some are not conscious of a definite assurance or have doubts about their having received the experience is no more valid ground for the rejection of the reality of sanctification than similar doubts about conversion would be for the denial of the reality of that experience. The second cleansing is as definite as is conversion and one may be equally assured of his possessing the experience.

CHAPTER VI

BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT

The personality of the Holy Spirit has been sufficiently discussed under theology proper. Now we are to inquire concerning the baptism with the Holy Spirit and what it comprehends. Because it is an aspect of salvation the consideration of this subject is appropriate under soteriology.

I. Nature of the Baptism with the Holy Spirit

1. **Expressions Representative of It.**—The most common formula for representing that special incoming to believers of the Spirit of God and of his mighty working in and through them is "baptized with the Holy Ghost." It was first used by John the Baptist concerning the work of the coming of Christ. "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, . . . he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire" (Matt. 3:11). The words "and with fire" are not to be understood to teach another baptism than that with the Holy Spirit. This "with" before fire is not found in the Greek text, which is indicated by its being printed in italics. The words "and fire" indicate a more thorough cleansing than that effected by John's baptism. This coming of the Holy Spirit is called a baptism because of the greatness of his working and power. Old Testament prophets received him as a spirit of prophecy temporarily, but had only a limited degree of his working. In the Christian dispensation believers have his presence and manifestations in a much greater measure, so they may be truly said to be overwhelmed or baptized with him. The significance of this expression is also shown by the words of Jesus, "For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence" (Acts 1:5).

The foregoing words of John and Jesus evidently refer to the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit. It is said of the disciples on that occasion, "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2:4). To be *filled* with the Holy Spirit is to be *baptized* with him. In the account of Peter's preaching to Cornelius it is said, "While Peter yet spake these words, the *Holy Ghost fell* on all them which heard the word. And they of the

circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was *poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost''* (Acts 10:44, 45). That the expressions ''Holy Ghost fell,'' ''the gift of the Holy Ghost,'' and ''filled with the Holy Ghost'' are identical with ''baptized with the Holy Ghost'' is shown by the words of Peter later when he identified that received by Cornelius with that received by the apostles at Pentecost, and both of these experiences with the baptism of the Holy Ghost which Jesus promised. ''And as I began to speak, the *Holy Ghost fell* on them, *as on us at the beginning.* Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be *baptized with the Holy Ghost.* Forasmuch then as God gave them *the like gift* as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God?'' (Acts 11:15-17).

In addition to the foregoing four expressions others are used of the baptism with the Holy Spirit, such as: ''the promise of my Father'' and ''endued with power from on high'' (Luke 24:49); ''receive the Holy Ghost'' (Acts 2:38; 19:2-6); ''the Holy Ghost came on them'' (Acts 19:2-6).

2. **A Definite Experience.**—The baptism of the Holy Spirit is a definite experience in the sense that it is a supernatural operation which God effects at a definite time. It is not a gradual growth or natural development in piety or spiritual power. It is as definite as is the experience of conversion, and one may be equally certain that he has received it. This is clear from the New Testament examples and statements concerning it. Jesus told the apostles to tarry at Jerusalem and not to undertake the work of evangelization to which he had commissioned them until they were endued with power by the baptism with the Holy Spirit. Jesus evidently regarded this baptism as an experience so definite that they would know certainly when they received it. Paul also wrote and spoke of it as an experience which men knew they had or had not. The apostles received the experience definitely on the day of Pentecost. The Samaritan believers received it when Peter and John laid their hands upon them. Cornelius received it while Peter preached to him. The twelve disciples at Ephesus received it at the time Paul's hands were laid upon them.

3. **Distinct from Regeneration.**—The Holy Spirit baptism is, like entire sanctification, distinct from and subsequent to the work of regeneration. And as justification and regeneration are distinct in nature yet simultaneous as to occurrence, so entire sanctification and the baptism with the Holy Ghost are distinct in their nature but take place at the same time. That the baptism with the Spirit is subsequent to and not at the time of conversion is evident from a casual reading of the Scriptures. The citation of a few texts and examples is sufficient evidence of this truth.

It is certain that the apostles were baptized with the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. While the account in the second chapter of Acts states that they were "filled with the Holy Ghost," but does not state in so many words that they were then baptized with the Spirit, yet in Acts 11:15, 16 the latter expression is used of the Pentecostal outpouring. That the apostles were baptized with the Spirit on the day of Pentecost is commonly allowed even by those who deny this experience is distinct from conversion. The vital question, then, is were the apostles regenerated before Pentecost? They had believed on Christ (John 17:8; Matt. 16:16), and therefore had been born again (John 1:12, 13). Their names were written in heaven, as were those of the Seventy (Luke 10:20). They had been sent out to preach the gospel (Matt. 10:7). They were not of the world (John 14:17; 15:19). They kept God's word (John 17:6). They were clean through the word (John 15:3), which is effected by "being born again . . . by the word of God" (1 Pet. 1:23). There is no room for any doubt as to their having been truly regenerated when the foregoing words were spoken, which was before Jesus' crucifixion. But after his resurrection Jesus told them to wait at Jerusalem for the promise of the Father, saying, "*Ye shall* be baptized with the Holy Ghost *not many days hence*" (Acts 1:5). They were converted, but their baptism with the Spirit was yet in the future. In perfect agreement with the foregoing statement are the words of Jesus telling them of the Comforter, "Whom *the world can not receive*, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him" (John 14:17).

Neither was the experience of the apostles abnormal, for the disciples of Samaria also received the Holy Spirit subsequently

to their conversion. When they "believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women" (Acts 8:12). It is incredible that this Spirit-commissioned evangelist, who was as definitely led and used of God as were any of the apostles, made the blunder of baptizing a large company of sinners. No such thing is intimated by the Sacred Record. Evidently they were regenerated as a result of their faith in Philip's preaching. In consequence of that, Philip baptized them. When the apostles at Jerusalem heard of the converts at Samaria they sent Peter and John to them. When Peter and John had reached Samaria and laid their hands upon them, the new disciples received the Holy Ghost. They were converted under the ministry of Philip, but they received the baptism with the Holy Spirit under the ministry of Peter and John a considerable time later.

The twelve disciples whom Paul found upon his arrival at Ephesus had not yet received the Holy Ghost. Yet they had "believed" (Acts 19:2), and were "disciples" (v. 1). Through the laying on of Paul's hands the Holy Spirit came on them (v. 6). As was shown in the preceding chapter, the apostle Paul and Cornelius and his household received the Holy Spirit after conversion. No example can be found in all the New Testament in which an unconverted person received the baptism of the Holy Spirit at the time of regeneration.

Yet in some sense the Spirit of God is with every regenerate person before he is "baptized" with the Spirit. When he promised the Comforter Jesus said, "He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you" (John 14:17). Also the apostle Paul said, "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom. 8:9). But these texts are not contradictory to those already cited. In the first text here quoted Jesus seems to make a distinction between the relation of the Spirit before and after conversion by the prepositions "with" and "in." Paul, however, makes no such distinctions. Every Christian has the Holy Spirit in him, but this is not saying every believer has the *baptism* with the Spirit. One may have the Spirit as a regenerating power and yet not have that great measure of his working that is implied in the baptism with the Spirit. The Spirit of God is omnipresent in his power to work.

He is with the sinner to convict of sin, with the justified person to keep him, and with those baptized with him as a mighty working force for the advancement of the kingdom of Christ, as a sanctifier, and as a comforter. The two texts here under consideration can be harmonized with the clear Bible teaching and examples of the baptism of the Holy Spirit subsequent to regeneration only by regarding the distinction between one's having the Holy Spirit and his having the *baptism* of the Holy Spirit. Evidently God's Word does not flatly contradict itself. Therefore the distinction here made is correct.

4. **Results of the Baptism with the Spirit.**—To receive the Holy Spirit is to receive his power and working. The baptism with the Holy Spirit is an enduement of special power and a special manifestation of divine power in and through the person baptized as a consequence of the establishment of a new relation to the Holy Ghost. The operation at the time of the Holy Spirit baptism has a double aspect. It is both subjective and objective, or it is a working *in* us and also a working *through* us. To exclude either of these two phases of his operation from our thinking of the Holy Spirit baptism is to hold a one-sided view.

The work effected in us by the baptism of the Spirit or the subjective results are especially entire cleansing from depravity, comfort, guidance, and teaching. Ecstatic emotions are often thought of as a result of the baptism with the Spirit and certainly sometimes such feelings do accompany it, as seems to have been the case at the Pentecostal outpouring, but there are no Scripture grounds for the assumption that they are the primary purpose of the baptism with the Spirit nor that they are the evidence of one's having received the experience. Ecstasies may be experienced also at conversion or at other times.

That the baptism with the Spirit results in an entire sanctification was shown in the preceding chapter. The cleansing aspect of the experience is forcefully represented by the symbol fire. "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire" (Matt. 3:11). Fire in this place implies the idea of refining, cleansing, and consuming. As impurities are separated from metals by a process of fire, so in the baptism with the Holy Spirit a perfect cleansing is effected. When the holy Son of God received the Holy Spirit it was in the form of a peaceful dove. But when the apostles, who were defiled with depraved natures,

were baptized with the Holy Spirit he appeared as "cloven tongues like as of fire" (Acts 2:3). No outward manifestation could better represent the idea of a cleansing at the time of the Holy Spirit baptism than does this fiery symbol of his presence.

The objective results of the baptism of the Spirit, or his work through us, consists principally in his enduing us with gifts and power for service in the kingdom of God. Jesus commanded his apostles to preach the gospel to the world, but first to tarry in Jerusalem until endued with power from on high through the coming of the Holy Spirit. Through the power of the Spirit received at Pentecost, Peter was able on that day to preach his notable sermon which resulted in the salvation of three thousand. The preaching of Stephen and of Paul was effective for the same reason. Some of the greatest soul-winners since the apostolic period attribute their success to their baptism with the Holy Spirit.

5. **One Baptism, but Many Fillings.**—The b a p t i s m with the Holy Ghost is also described in the Scriptures as being "filled with the Holy Ghost." That the baptism may be a filling with the Spirit is certain from Acts 1:5 and Acts 2:4. Yet the two expressions are not always used synonymously. After one has been baptized with the Holy Spirit, however great may have been the degree of his working then, one will need to be filled with the Spirit again and again subsequently. These refillings with the Spirit are clearly represented in the Scriptures.

When, after the healing of the lame man at the Gate Beautiful, Peter was brought to trial before the high priest and enquiry was made as to the power by which the miracle was done, "Then Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said unto them" (Acts 4:8). Peter had been filled with the Holy Ghost when baptized by the Spirit at Pentecost, but here in a time of stress the Spirit again comes upon him in mighty power; so it may properly be said he was *filled* with his working. Also when Peter and the other apostles were forbidden to preach in Jesus' name and threatened, they prayed and the place was shaken where they were gathered "and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost" (Acts 4:31). Here all the apostles were again filled with the Holy Spirit. Stephen was filled with the Holy Ghost at his martyrdom, though it is said he was full of the Holy Ghost before. The apostle Paul received the Holy Ghost

at the hands of Ananias, but he was again "filled with the Holy Ghost" when he rebuked the sorcerer (Acts 13:9).

Such refillings of the Spirit are important to the greatest usefulness in Christian service. The initial filling with the Holy Spirit is not enough. With each forward step in God's service a new filling is needful. Those who rest content with that first filling which occurred ten or twenty years ago will be doomed to an empty and largely fruitless Christian life. We do not mean the Spirit frequently leaves those who have received him, but they need a new manifestation of his working. To be filled with the Spirit does not mean one receives a greater measure of the Spirit himself. He is a person, and if we have him we have him in his entirety. But we do receive a greater measure of his power. Those who have been much used of God are familiar with these special fillings. The preacher may be temporarily filled with the Spirit for the preaching of a sermon, or for the conducting of a revival.

These many fillings with the Spirit can not properly be called rebaptisms by him. The Scriptures never so represent them. To call them rebaptisms of the Holy Spirit leads to confusion. The initial baptism of the Spirit is a receiving of him, or his coming into a new relation with us. It also includes certain subjective operations, such as entire removal of depravity, which are not repeated in the many fillings. The baptism with the Spirit and being filled with him may occur simultaneously, but either may be received without the other. That frequent fillings may follow baptism with the Spirit has already been shown. One may receive the Holy Spirit without being especially filled with his workings. Filling accompanied the baptism in the cases of the apostles, Cornelius, and the Ephesians, but there are no grounds for believing there was a filling in the baptism with the Spirit of the Samaritans and of Paul. Some persons today are filled with the working of the Spirit when they receive him, while others are not; yet these who are not are often filled with the Holy Ghost after they have received him.

Such distinctions may at first seem to be mere useless hair-splitting, but in reality they are important to us if we would avoid confusion and doubt about our religious experiences. For lack of recognizing the possibility of fillings subsequent to the

baptism with the Spirit of God, Christians may fail to give place for these later manifestations. Also false teachers often take advantage of the craving for these fresh anointings by the Spirit and cause people to think they have never received him, when they have, thus causing confusion about all their past experience. It is a great mistake and is dangerous for such to throw down their Ebenezers and to begin to seek what has already been received. To do so is to invite deception.

II. Gifts of the Spirit

1. **Nature of Charismata.**—The gifts of the Spirit, or spiritual gifts, as they are designated in 1 Cor. 12:1, are technically called charismata. These gifts are supernatural abilities bestowed upon Christians by the Spirit of God to equip them for the service of the church and the upbuilding of the kingdom of God. Various lists of these gifts are given in the Pauline epistles. The longest list is found in 1 Cor. 12:4-11, 28-30. Nine are there named as follows: wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, speaking in tongues, and interpretation of tongues. In Rom. 12:6-8 seven are named: prophecy, ministering, teaching, exhortation, giving, ruling, and showing mercy. In Eph. 4:7-12 is a third list of gifts, as follows: apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. In these three lists eighteen different gifts are named. Evidently none of these lists is exhaustive, and there is good reason to believe that all taken together do not include all the gifts of the Spirit, either possible or actual.

It is clear from the Pauline texts cited that the spiritual gifts form the basis for the offices in the church. For example, one is an apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor, teacher, or exhorter, not by virtue of a human appointment, but because the Holy Spirit has conferred upon him the gift which corresponds to one of these particular offices. Only as he has the gift can he have the office. But this is true only of those gifts which correspond to offices. Some gifts are not applicable to the exercise of an office. Examples of the latter class are the gifts of wisdom, faith, healing, miracles, tongues, or interpretation of tongues. Because the number of the gifts of the Spirit must correspond to the needs of the church, and the number of those needs is variable, it follows that neither the lists of the gifts in

the Scriptures nor any we might here give should be regarded as exhaustive. Whatever supernatural ability the Holy Spirit may give to any person to fulfil a needed function in the church may properly be called a charism.

As is true of many other spiritual realities, the nature of spiritual gifts is not capable of full logical definition in the present state of human knowledge. Certainly they are not to be regarded as mere natural abilities. Such a view is excluded by the designation "gifts of the Spirit." They are supernatural, but evidently they usually have an intimate relation to natural human abilities. But what is their relation to natural powers? Probably not always, but usually, spiritual gifts are bestowed in conformity with one's natural capabilities. They are given, as were the talents in the parable of Jesus, "to every man according to his several ability," both as to kind and number. Ordinarily God works *with* human instruments rather than independently of them. In the exercise of spiritual gifts, natural abilities are not excluded, but included, exalted, and augmented. Such a view is in harmony with what we know of God's method of cooperating with the human powers in other respects. In the writing of the Scriptures there was such an interworking of the human and divine that neither excluded nor restricted the operation of the other. Other examples of this interworking of the human and divine may be seen in the preaching of a sermon under the power of the Holy Spirit, or in the government of the church.

Not all supernatural works through men are to be attributed to the possession of spiritual gifts on the part of those persons instrumental in their performance. All believers have a measure of faith, but all do not have the gift of faith. Because of that faith common to all Christians, any one may have an occasional miraculous answer to his prayers if God be pleased to have it so. But this does not mean such a person has the gift of healing or of miracles. Likewise the Spirit of God may come upon any preacher or other Christian on a special occasion and enable him to prophesy. Such manifestations are special and occur only occasionally with an individual. The work of those who have a special spiritual gift will be characterized by corresponding manifestations.

2. **Not Given Alike to All.**—Nothing concerning the gifts of the

Spirit is more clearly stated in the Scriptures than that all Christians do not possess the same gifts. More than once the apostle Paul discourses at length in his epistles concerning this fact. "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another. Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering: or he that teacheth, on teaching" (Rom. 12:4-7). The same general argument is given in the twelfth chapter of 1 Corinthians at greater length. There it is said one gift is given to one person and another gift to another, and that this distribution is made by the Spirit of God as he pleases. The church is represented as being like the human body with its many members, each having its own particular function to perform. So Christians are represented as members of the body of Christ, the church, and as a result of their being given different spiritual gifts as performing different functions therein. One member can not fill the place of another, because of their having different gifts.

Because all do not have the same gifts, it is certain all do not possess all the gifts. To appeal to the Apostle's illustration again, the human body, it would be as unreasonable to affirm that all members of the church have all the gifts as to say that all members of one's physical body have the ability to see, hear, taste, or smell, or that the foot is able to perform the functions of the hand. Paul closes the reasoning in 1 Corinthians 12 by asking, "Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" (vs. 29, 30). It is clearly implied that the answer to all of these questions is no. The error of assuming that all Christians have any particular gift or all of them is harmful. If it does not lead them to unwarranted presumption, it will often result in disappointment and doubts about their Christian experience and especially about their having been baptized of the Holy Spirit.

While it is true that all do not have the same gifts, nor all the gifts, it is also true that every member of the body of Christ possesses at least one gift. "But to *each one* is given the mani-

festation of the Spirit to profit withal'' (1 Cor. 12:7, R. V.). The Holy Spirit divides ''to every man severally as *he* will.'' We do not have the responsibility of deciding what gift or gifts we should have. He who sets the members in the body as it pleases him is properly the one to determine what gifts a particular person should possess. One person may possess several different gifts, as did the apostle Paul.

3. **When Spiritual Gifts May Be Received.**—May the gifts of the Spirit be received only at the time of the baptism by the Holy Spirit, or may they also be received subsequently? If one receives a gift when baptized with the Spirit may he later receive other gifts? We know the gift of tongues was given to the apostles, to Cornelius, and to the Ephesians when they received the Holy Spirit. The Ephesians also received prophecy at the same time. Because of these examples some have assumed spiritual gifts are given at no other time. But a careful study of Paul's teaching to the Corinthians shows spiritual gifts may be received subsequently. In 1 Cor. 12:13 it is stated that all of them had received the Holy Spirit. ''And have been *all* made to drink into one Spirit.'' Yet in the last verse of the chapter they are exhorted, ''Covet earnestly the best gifts,'' and in 14:1, ''Desire spiritual gifts.'' But if those gifts were given only at the time of their baptism by the Spirit, which time was past with them, then these exhortations were meaningless. Doubtless gifts may be bestowed upon us at any time subsequent to the coming of the Holy Spirit. In the nature of things there is no reason why, as the Spirit of God directs us into new kinds of Christian service, he should not impart to us gifts appropriate to that work. It is especially reasonable to expect that one will be given suitable spiritual gifts at the time he is called into the work of the ministry.

III. The Gift of Tongues

Speaking in tongues, or glossolalia as it is theologically designated, is properly a subject for discussion under the heading of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. In three important instances the Holy Spirit baptism was accompanied with speaking in tongues. Except for these instances it might well be treated merely as one among the several other gifts of the Spirit.

1. **Nature of New Testament Glossolalia.**—In Mark 16:17 is recorded the prediction of Jesus that one of the signs to follow believers would be the speaking in new tongues. The occurrence of this manifestation is mentioned in Acts 10:44-46 and Acts 19:6. It is described at length in Acts 2:1-13 and in 1 Corinthians 12-14. In no other text is so much given concerning the nature of speaking in tongues as in 1 Corinthians 14. An important difference between the Pentecostal manifestation and that described in the fourteenth of 1 Corinthians is that at Pentecost languages were spoken which were the vernacular of many present, while that at Corinth is represented as being unintelligible to any one present (1 Cor. 14:2), not even to the speaker (v. 14). Definitions of the gift of tongues have conflicted as they have been based upon either of these descriptions to the exclusion of the other. The speaking in tongues both at Jerusalem and at Corinth are to be regarded as a fulfilment of Jesus' prediction that believers should speak with new tongues. Therefore, any true definition of New Testament glossolalia must make a place for all the facts of both of these records.

Because of the many incorrect views concerning speaking in tongues a first step in showing the nature of it is to show what it is not. The "other tongues" at Pentecost certainly do not refer to their physical tongues, as held by Thayer, because in Acts 2:6, 8 they are represented as languages. They were not mere strange, archaic, or poetic words, as held by Baur and others, for the term "tongue" has no such use in other places in the Bible. Neither can these tongues properly be regarded as merely new interpretations of the Old Testament prophecies, for the Bible represents them as languages, not interpretations. They were not a miracle of hearing as was held by Gregory Nazianzus, Bede, Erasmus, and others of the present. In other words, though the disciples did not speak their usual language, yet the Holy Ghost caused their auditors to hear in their own languages, which were foreign to the speaker. Such a miracle is claimed for certain of the Roman Catholic saints and is certainly possible, but such is not described in the text under consideration, for the miracle is said to be in the speaking, not in the hearing. They spoke with "other" tongues (v. 4), and their hearers heard them in their "own" tongues (v. 6), the languages in which they spoke.

The New Testament speaking in tongues was an endowment by the Spirit of God with supernatural ability to speak a real language which the speaker had never learned and which was accordingly unknown to him. Unless those happened to be present who were acquainted with the language being spoken the words of the speaker were unintelligible to those present, which was usually the case at Corinth (1 Cor. 14:2, 5, 9). Even the speaker himself did not understand what he said. His "understanding is unfruitful" (v. 14). The gift of tongues is nowhere represented as the gift of the knowledge of a language, but as the gift of the ability to speak a language as the Spirit gives utterance (Acts 2:4). This speaking is by the operation of the Spirit of God, who directs the speaker's vocal organs. The speaker, unless he have the gift of interpretation, not only is unaware of what his words mean, but if others should speak in the same language in which he speaks he would not understand them unless he were given the ability supernaturally. The mere absence of those who understand, either naturally or supernaturally, the language being spoken is no evidence that it is unintelligible jargon or not a real language.

Speaking in tongues is edifying in the public assembly if those present know the language spoken, as at the Pentecostal manifestation. If such, nor any one with the gift of interpretation, are not present to make known what is spoken, then the speaker should "keep silence in the church" and "speak to himself, and to God" (1 Cor. 14:28). Yet "he that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth himself" (v. 4), even though his understanding is not exercised. An emotional edification is possible in such a case, and would naturally result from the experience of ecstasy in which the speaking in tongues took place at Pentecost and evidently at Corinth.

2. **Purpose of Speaking in Tongues.**—The gift of tongues is not, as many have supposed, primarily for the purpose of preaching the gospel by missonaries to people speaking a foreign language. It is true that certain of the church fathers held this view, and it is alleged that Bernard, Anthony, Francis Xavier, and other Roman Catholic saints of the Dark Ages were understood in other tongues than those in which they spoke, or were able to speak, but it may well be questioned whether any such idea can be gathered from the statements of the Scriptures.

Doubtless God could cause tongues to be spoken for this purpose if he were pleased to do so, but no such purpose of it is upheld by the Bible.

Several reasons may be given for believing the gift of tongues is not for the purpose of evangelizing. (1) Probably only Aramaic was necessary to enable them to speak to every person present at Pentecost. These, like Saul of Tarsus, Apollos of Alexandria, and Aquila of Rome, were devout Jews of the dispersion, in all representing fifteen different countries. Yet being Jews, probably all knew Aramaic, the language of the Jews, as well as the language of the particular land in which they dwelt. The Greek language, which had become widely spoken through the conquests of Alexander, would possibly be understood by all of them. If the gift of tongues had been for the purpose of evangelizing, then its exercise on this occasion was superfluous. (2) They began speaking in tongues before the crowd gathered, which was not necessary if the purpose was to evangelize. (3) Peter's sermon, which was preached after the crowd had assembled as a result of the tongues manifestations, was not in tongues, for all could understand it, and besides it could not have been in more than one tongue. It is not said that any preaching was done in tongues, but that the speaking in tongues consisted in declaring the "wonderful works of God." (4) Paul spoke in tongues extensively (1 Cor. 14:18), yet he did not know the language of the Lycaonians when they said, "The gods are come down to us," and only understood the intent of the people by their actions (Acts 14:11-18). Paul doubtless spoke to them in Greek, the common language of Asia Minor. (5) All of the New Testament, with the possible exception of Matthew, was written in Greek. If this one language was sufficient at that time for the written gospel, why not for the spoken message? Greek was almost a universal language in the Apostolic Age. (6) The New Testament writers and apostles did not get their knowledge of Greek by a supernatural gift, for their diction is defective, containing barbarisms, localisms, and Hebraisms, as is to be expected in the language of those speaking another than their mother tongue. (7) The New Testament tells of no evangelizing in tongues, and reliable history tells of none since apostolic times. (8) From what we know of God's dealings with men generally, it is reasonable to believe that he will

not put a premium on indolence by supernaturally bestowing knowledge which men may as well acquire by natural processes.

What then is the real purpose of speaking in tongues? Paul states that it is for a sign to unbelievers. But in what sense is it a sign? At pentecost it was the evident manifestation of supernatural power in this respect that was the cause of amazement to the Jews. It is the supernatural element in it that constitutes it a sign. Its value in this respect may be illustrated in a measure by a similar value in other ecstatic demonstrations such as leaping and shouting by those especially blessed in spirit. Like these, speaking in tongues may convince and draw sometimes, and in other instances people may be repelled by it. Its effects in this respect will depend largely upon the particular type of individual unbeliever or the community before which it is exercised. Such a sign was probably of special value at ancient Corinth because similar manifestations were common in the heathen priests there and were generally regarded as proof of a divine possession. But it is probable that in centers of civilization and culture in our day more rational proofs of the divine element in Christianity has a much stronger appeal.

A secondary benefit that results from speaking in tongues is the edification of the one who speaks (1 Cor. 14:4). This edification is not in the nature of intellectual enlightenment, but in emotional experience. Though those who speak in tongues are edified in this exercise, yet it does not follow that such edification is possible only through speaking in tongues. Speaking in tongues is but one of several exercises by which one's spirit may be similarly built up.

3. **Post-Apostolic Speaking in Tongues.**—Justin Martyr, of the second century, mentions personal acquaintance with those Christians who spoke in tongues; and Irenæus, of the same period, speaks of "many brethren in the church who . . . through the Spirit speak all kinds of languages," probably referring to the instances among the Montanists. The Waldenses and Albigenses of the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries, those much persecuted, but devout and earnest opposers of papal error, are said to have had many manifestations of speaking in tongues among them. The Huguenots, of France, in the seventeenth century had very remarkable instances of speaking in tongues among them. As much might be said of the followers of Edward

Irving, in London, in the early part of the nineteenth century. Also instances are claimed among the Franciscans, the Jansenites, the early Quakers, in the Irish revivals of 1859, and the great Welsh revivals of 1904. Also many other examples of speaking in tongues are alleged to have taken place in the last century in America and Europe. The "modern tongues movement" first began to attract attention in Los Angeles, Cal., in 1906.

If the question be asked, Are all these manifestations to be attributed to the Spirit of God? the reply must be in the negative. This is allowed even by those who profess to speak in tongues. Our knowledge of the nature of some of these manifestations is too meager to make possible an intelligent opinion as to the source of them.

The possible sources of speaking in tongues are three: (1) Divine, (2) Satanic, (3) Human. That the Spirit of God may speak through those whom he possesses is not difficult for belief by those who believe the Bible is God's Word. That a demon can speak through those he possesses is evident from the words spoken through the Gadarene demoniac to Jesus, "What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not? For he said unto him, Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit" (Mark 5:7, 8). See also verse 9. Here the demon spirit in the man used the vocal organs of the latter to speak to Jesus. Evidently demons can speak through men as well in one language as in another. Probably it was to such speaking in tongues that Paul alluded when he said, "No man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed" (1 Cor. 12:3). A psychological ground may be found in human nature for speaking in tongues. Knowledge once gained by the mind is never lost, it is said, even though it is not always possible to recollect it. But in moments of excitement an abnormal awakening of the memory may occur so one may be able to repeat words and even long passages he has heard in either his own or a foreign language. This abnormal awakening may also occur in times of danger or illness. Coleridge tells of an uneducated servant girl, who when ill with fever, in her delirium repeated long passages verbatim from the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin classics. It was later discovered she had heard these passages read aloud by an aged minister in

whose home she had been formerly employed. Likewise one in a state of religious frenzy may thus be able to repeat foreign words and phrases which he has heard, but of which he does not know the meaning.

4. **Not the Evidence of the Holy Spirit Baptism.**—Two errors in doctrinal teaching have been characteristic of nearly all factions of the "modern tongues movement." First, they affirm that all who receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit will speak in tongues as the evidence. Second, it is held that the Scriptures make a difference between the gift of tongues and speaking in tongues, or that one may speak in tongues without possessing the gift. These two theories are fundamental to the "modern tongues movement" and give it its character. If one believes these two doctrines and is conscientious, he will feel obligated to seek until he speaks in tongues, however long a time that may be. The belief of them tends to exalt speaking in tongues above everything else.

We do not hesitate to say there is not a single text of Scripture which teaches that speaking in tongues always follows the baptism by the Holy Spirit. Not one of the apostles or inspired writers ever taught it, and not one of the world's great soul-winners ever taught it. The majority of the greatest and most useful preachers of the Christian era have not spoken in tongues; and it is unreasonable to think that these special instruments of God, who themselves believed they had received the baptism of the Spirit, were deceived, and to suppose many whose lives have been utterly fruitless have received him merely because they are supposed to speak in tongues. The fact that speaking in tongues may result from demon possession or may be properly attributed to human causes is proof that it can not be a certain evidence of the baptism by the Spirit. It may equally as well be evidence of mere religious frenzy or of one's having a devil as of his having the Holy Spirit.

On only three occasions does the Bible state that speaking in tongues accompanied the outpouring of the Spirit; see Acts 2:4; 10:45; 19:6. Of all the other converts who received the Holy Ghost there is no proof that they spoke in tongues. Those who teach this theory on the ground of these three texts are guilty of the fallacy of unsound reasoning. They generalize on too narrow a basis, as do those who reason that because

changes are found to take place within a particular species of plant or animal, therefore all living species, including man himself, have evolved from lifeless matter. As sound reasoning repudiates the idea of evolution as being an unproved theory, so it must likewise reject the theory that tongues are the evidence of the Holy Spirit baptism. There are also reasons for believing tongues manifestations did not usually accompany the outpouring of God's Spirit on people in apostolic times. The first to speak in tongues were the apostles at Pentecost. There was a special reason for this and it was justified by the results. The next who are said to have spoken in tongues were Cornelius and his household. It is reasonable that these first Gentiles to receive the baptism with the Spirit should thus speak in tongues. Peter in speaking of this incident said, "As I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning." If all the many thousands who had received the Holy Ghost during the eight years since Pentecost had always received the tongues, why did Peter say, "As on us at the beginning"? Why could he not as well have said, "As he has been baptizing all since the beginning"? Why should Luke thus point back to Pentecost if all had spoken in tongues since Pentecost? Evidently because, as Paul reasons in 1 Cor. 12:30, that all do not speak in tongues.

It was prophecy, not speaking in tongues, that was predicted to follow the outpouring of the Spirit (Joel 2:28), and certainly this is far more valuable. In 1 Cor. 14:1 Paul reasons that prophecy is superior to speaking in tongues. But why should we suppose a man with this superior gift has not been baptized with the Spirit, while assuming that another has received the Spirit merely because he manifests the inferior gift of tongues? No outward manifestation is the true evidence of the baptism with the Holy Spirit. Only those unfamiliar with the witness of the Spirit need such an evidence. It is said this baptism is so important there must be some outward evidence. In reply we ask, what could be more important than the salvation of one's soul? Yet conversion is not attested by a physical sign. Paul states that we know we are saved by the double witness of the Spirit of God and of our own spirits, which are not of the nature of outward signs. That the Spirit testifies to his own coming in the same manner is entirely reasonable to believe.

Still another reason why tongues are not the evidence of the baptism with the Holy Spirit is that this teaching makes them a sign to believers. But Paul says they are *not* a sign to believers, but to the unbeliever. A certain writer of the "tongues movement" has admitted that "the doctrine that all are to speak in tongues when baptized in the Spirit is based entirely upon supposition without a solitary 'Thus saith the Lord.'"

In answer to the claim that speaking in tongues as at Pentecost is different from the gift of tongues as at Corinth, it may be said that speaking is the only way to exercise the gift. It has been affirmed by one that "the manifestation of the Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:7) is to be identified with the speaking in tongues at Pentecost, but not with the exercise of the gift of tongues. They say the "manifestation of the Spirit" is for all who receive the Spirit, but that the gift of tongues is not given to all. But such a distinction has no support in the Scriptures and clearly bears the marks of having been invented to support the theory that speaking with tongues is the evidence of the baptism with the Spirit. After stating "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal" (v. 7), the Apostle immediately proceeds to show that these "manifestations" are through the different gifts, nine of which he names. "The manifestation of the Spirit" includes all the gifts. The "manifestation" (v. 7) is identical with the "gifts" (v. 4) and the "operations" (v. 6). In the first sentence of the chapter the Apostle states that he is writing "concerning spiritual gifts." When nearing the close of the twelfth chapter of 1 Corinthians, Paul summed up his foregoing arguments by stating that God had not given the same gifts to all in the church, but had distributed them as he willed. Verses 28-30 must be connected with the verses 7-11. It is all one argument. In verse 30 he says, "Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues?" The implication is clear that the answer must be, No. We agree with the Apostle that all do not speak with tongues. Therefore, speaking with tongues can not be the evidence of the baptism with the Spirit.

5. **Proper Attitude Towards Speaking in Tongues.**—Two opposite extremes should be avoided in our attitude toward speaking in tongues. We should not fall into the error of the Corinthian church and of some who profess to speak in tongues today by

exalting tongues manifestations out of proper proportion to all other operations of the Spirit. The opposite extreme to be avoided is the excluding of all speaking in tongues as being improper or not of God. Paul very well described the proper attitude when he said, "Covet to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues" (1 Cor. 14:39). Keep other gifts more prominent because they are of more value, but allow the speaking in tongues, because it is the operation of God's Spirit and for God's glory. Paul does not urge the speaking in tongues, neither should we urge it. It should not be regarded as proof of deep spirituality in the speaker, as it is the least important of all gifts. The church at Corinth spoke much in tongues, yet it was one of the least spiritual of the New Testament congregations, being "carnal," having division and strife among themselves, tolerating one guilty of incest, and going to law with each other. We should not condemn all speaking in tongues as of the devil nor accept all as being of God.

We are not to understand, however, that Paul's instruction, "Forbid not to speak with tongues," means that the speaker or the church should put no restraint on the exercise of the gift. In the public gathering Paul himself forbids all improper use of it. He lays down four principles for the regulation of the gift as follows:

(1) *Proportionate Value.* It should be regarded as being much less important than other gifts of the Spirit, especially prophecy. "In the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue" (1 Cor. 14:19). He also says, to have charity alone is better than to have all spiritual gifts without it. Tongues must not crowd out these more important things, but always be subordinate.

(2) *For Edification.* "Let all things be done unto edifying" (1 Cor. 14:26). The public service is for the edification and benefit of all, not a place for one individual selfishly to display his gifts either for his personal edification or to satisfy his own vanity or pride. This was a common error at Corinth as well as among many today. Since speaking in an unknown tongue not understood by the congregation is not edifying to them, reason as well as Scripture teaches that the congregation should not be burdened with such public demonstrations unless

one is present who can interpret what is said. "But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself, and to God" (1 Cor. 14:28).

(3) *Orderliness.* "Let all things be done decently and in order" (1 Cor. 14:40). Orderliness is characteristic of God both in the material and in the spiritual realms. Can we imagine God responsible for, or pleased with, a meeting where several persons lie prostrate and seemingly unconscious on the floor, a number of them at the same time suddenly breaking out in what purports to be unknown tongues? Is such lying prostrate by men and women in the aisles of a public place according to decency? Does order allow such a babel of tongues? Is it becoming to the house of God? "If therefore the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad" (1 Cor. 14:23).

(4) *Self-Control.* "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets" (1 Cor. 14:32). Opposed to this statement from Paul is a theory held by many today that those who speak with tongues are under the direct control of the Holy Spirit and are not personally responsible for their particular actions and speaking, and that to interfere with their actions is rebuking the Holy Ghost. They suppose their lack of self-control is proof of the control of the Spirit. The heathen theory is that divine possession excludes the use of reason. It is characteristic of possession by a demon spirit to destroy one's free will and to compel one to do that which he would not. Such loss of self-control may also in some instances be traced to purely human causes. But the Spirit of God never deprives persons of their freedom. God gave us our reason, and his glory does not require that he take it away. His method is to cooperate with our wills, not to override them. It has been well said, that "the highest Christian experience is not attained through the abandonment of one's own faculties, the abnegation of one's own personality, the surrender of one's own consciousness." It is unscriptural and unbecoming for a Christian to give himself over unreservedly to a mysterious power and to unconsciousness. God gave us our free will and consciousness and is most glorified by our retaining them. True consecration is not, as some wrongly suppose, a giving away of one's reason and personality.

God does not want men to do this. It does not honor him, but rather dishonors him by our giving away that very thing that makes for intelligent, voluntary worship of him. Consecration means rather a continual willingness to exercise our free volitions as God pleases while at all times we retain the power to will and otherwise. This is far more honoring to God than to let ourselves sink into unconsciousness, which is nowhere taught in the Bible.

Chapter VII

DIVINE PHYSICAL HEALING

Works on systematic theology of the past have usually omitted consideration of the doctrine of divine healing of the body, but because of its large place in the Scriptures and especially in view of the special interest in the subject among Christians of the present time, no such work is complete which fails to treat this subject. It is properly discussed under Soteriology because it is one of the benefits of the atonement and an aspect of salvation from the effects of the fall.

I. The Fact of Divine Healing

The actuality of the occurrence of divine healing is not a question of theory but one of fact. Either such healing has actually been effected or it has not. If its reality can be shown, then theology may properly inquire as to the nature of such healing and the conditions on which it is performed. What is the evidence, then, that divine healing is a reality?

1. **Scriptural Examples of Healing.**—The several arguments given under the heading Apologetics in proof of the actual occurrence of miracles need not here be repeated. That miracles are possible and probable, that the proof of their occurrence is possible, and that they have actually occurred is here assumed to have been already sufficiently proved. The present question is, what is the Scriptural evidence that this particular class of miracles, the healing of physical ailments, has occurred?

The Scriptures record instances of healing as performed, not only by Jesus, but also by the apostles and other New Testament preachers, and by prophets of the Old Testament period. Notable among the healings described in the Old Testament are those of Naaman and Hezekiah. The first of these men was a great Syrian military leader and the other one of the greatest kings of Judah. Both were men of intelligence thoroughly competent to judge as to the reality of their diseases and cures. Naaman was afflicted with leprosy, a disease incurable by any human methods then known. But by obedience to the commandment of Elisha, the prophet, in dipping himself seven times in the waters of the Jordan he was instantly cured entirely of the leprosy. Elisha ascribed the healing to the power of God. In

view of all the facts the account is entirely credible. Hezekiah suffered from a severe boil which God told him through the prophet Isaiah would prove fatal. In answer to Hezekiah's earnest prayer he was healed and permitted to live thereafter for fifteen years.

In fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies (Isa. 35:4-6; Matt. 8:16, 17) Jesus healed many. He healed "all manner of sicknesses and all manner of disease among the people" (Matt. 4:23; 9:35). He healed all who came to him. None were turned away. Particular instances of notable miraculous healings by him are: the nobleman's son twenty-five miles away (John 4), Peter's mother-in-law of a fever (Matt. 8:14, 15), the leper (Matt. 8:2), the paralytic (Matt. 9:2), the lame man at the Pool of Bethesda (John 5:5-9), the withered hand (Matt. 12:10), the woman bowed together (Luke 13:10-20), the centurion's servant (Matt. 8:5), the Gadarene demoniac (Mark 5:2), the woman who touched the hem of his garment (Luke 8:48), two blind men (Matt. 9:27), the daughter of the Syrophenician woman (Matt. 15:21), the blind man of Jerusalem (John 9), and blind Bartimæus (Luke 18:35-43). These are but a few of the many instances particularly described. On various occasions vast multitudes came to him with their sick and diseased and he healed them all (Matt. 8:16).

After the crucifixion of Jesus his apostles continued to perform wonderful healings. Peter healed the lame man at the gate of the temple (Acts 3:2), also Æneas of Lydda, who was similarly afflicted (Acts 9:34). Paul healed the lame man at Lystra (Acts 14:10), and many at Ephesus and elsewhere (Acts 19:12). Neither was power to heal limited to the apostles as is sometimes affirmed. Stephen and Philip, the evangelist, were instrumental in wonderful healings (Acts 6:8; 8:7). To deny the reality of these miracles of healing is to deny the credibility of the Scriptures. Regardless of the subject or of the nature or severity of the affliction, all were healed who came.

2. **Post-Apostolic Healing.**—Contrary to a prevalent idea, divine healing did not cease with the death of the apostles. Because of the early declension of true Christianity and spirituality there came gradually a cessation of divine healing in a great measure, yet reliable history testifies to healings as being common in the second and third centuries, and there is evidence it

did not entirely cease at any time, even during the Dark Ages. Justin Martyr, of the second century, describes the casting out of demons in his day as follows: "For numberless demoniacs throughout the whole world, and in your city, many of our Christian men, exorcising them in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, have healed, and do heal, rendering helpless and driving possessing devils out of the men, though they could not be cured by all the other exorcists, and those who used incantations and drugs" (Apology II, Chap. 6). Origen, of the third century, wrote that "the name of Jesus can still remove distractions from the minds of men, and expel demons, and also take away disease." Tertullian, of the same period, testified to the healing of many. Chrysostom and Augustine also testified to actual instances of healing. Another of the fourth century, Theodorus, of Mopsuestia, is quoted as saying, "Many heathen amongst us are being healed by Christians from whatsoever sickness they have, so abundant are miracles in our midst." That miracles of healing had not ceased as late as the fourth century is affirmed by the historian Mosheim.

At a later period divine healing was also taught and practised by the Waldenses and Moravians. In post-Reformation times among those whose labors were accompanied by instances of healing were the Covenanters of Scotland, the early Friends, especially in the days of George Fox, the early Methodists, Luther, Wesley, Whitefield, Baxter, Irving, Thomas Erskine, Dorothea Trudell, Blumhardt, Rein, and Stockmayer.

3. **A Present Reality.**—Probably at no time since the period of early Christianity has the teaching and practise of divine healing been more common than in recent years. Many miraculous healings are being done in various Christian lands and also among Christians of heathen lands. These healings include the cure of all kinds of diseases, many of the cures being instantaneous and as wonderful as those recorded in the Scriptures. These healings have not been limited to any particular religious body. They have occurred, not only among "holiness" bodies, but in several instances among those of the older and larger Protestant denominations. Of the latter the Anglican Church has given special prominence to it, although healings have been more common in some of the former class. Some persons have been especially instrumental in the healing of the sick. It is

not to be assumed that the doctrinal teaching generally of such persons, nor that of the religious bodies with which they are associated, is necessarily correct merely because God is pleased to operate in this respect through them. It might as well be assumed that the special blessing of God upon an evangelist in soul-winning is evidence that the doctrinal teaching of that evangelist or of his denomination is altogether Scriptural.

These present-day healings are often done publicly before many witnesses. They can be and have been critically investigated. It is true that some who claim to be healed are not, and that others receive but temporary relief; but that many are genuinely and permanently cured none can successfully deny. To shut one's eyes to facts is useless. Divine healing is a present-day reality and is not open to question as to its actual occurrence.

II. The Reasonableness of Divine Healing

1. **An Aspect of Christ's Redemptive Work.**—We have already shown that death was not the portion of man in the time of his primitive holiness. His body was created essentially mortal, but through the divine provision of the tree of life, death did not become actual. Inasmuch as the eating of the tree of life resulted in the rejuvenation of the body and the overcoming of the tendency to death, it must also have been a preventative or remedy for disease. As death became actual through man's sin, so likewise sickness and disease, which before were but a possibility, now became an actuality. But sickness is not only a result of sin in that sin barred man from the tree of life, the preventative of sickness; sickness and disease are in a considerable measure a natural consequence of sinful indulgence and of the unnatural conditions effected by man's fall into sin. In the condition of their original creation, when God pronounced them "very good," probably men's bodies were not such an easy prey to disease as at the present time.

Because physical disease and pain are the consequence of sin and in a measure a penalty for sin, it is proper to expect provisions in the redemptive work of Christ for the overcoming of physical disease. It is true that redemption is not complete until the resurrection of men's bodies, but the sting of death is now removed so it is "gain" to the Christian rather than a penalty. But reason leads one to believe the great work of

Christ's redemption ought to include provisions for deliverance from physical suffering in this life. Unless it does provide for physical healing it is certainly not a complete redemption. But we believe it is a perfect redemption and should therefore expect to find healing for the body therein. And in this expectation we are not disappointed.

The evangelical prophet, Isaiah, in that wonderful fifty-third chapter concerning the atonement begins by saying, "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows" (Isa. 53:4). The evangelist Matthew quotes these words as follows: "Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses" (Matt. 8:17). That such a translation of Matthew's quotation is correct is evident from the connection in which he makes the quotation and the interpretation he gives it. That the inspiring Spirit made no mistake in that interpretation in Matthew's gospel is also shown by other renderings of these words in Isa. 53:4. In his commentary on this text Albert Barnes renders the words in harmony with Matthew's reading. The Septuagint rendering of the preceding verse, instead of "acquainted with grief," is "acquainted with the bearing of sickness." The original word rendered "grief" in both the third and fourth verses of the common version is the same word in the Hebrew. Therefore as it is rendered sickness in the third verse of the Septuagint so the same word in the fourth verse may be properly rendered. According to Dr. Strong's Exhaustive Concordance the Hebrew word *choliy,* rendered "griefs" in verse four of the common version, may be translated "disease" or "sickness," and the Hebrew word *makob,* rendered "sorrows" in the common English version, may be translated "pain." With such a reading of Isa. 53:4 we have still further support of the reading in Matt. 8:17. Also the original words for "bear" and "carry" in Isa. 53:4 denote, not mere sympathy, but the actual substitution and utter removal of the thing borne. It is a bearing away as in the case of the bearing away of sins by the scapegoat. Therefore as Christ has borne our sins, in some sense he has also borne our sicknesses so that our bearing them is unnecessary. After Matthew tells of how Jesus healed the multitudes of sick persons who were brought to him he said, "He . . . healed all that were sick: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our

infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.'' According to this inspired statement Jesus healed the sick, not merely in order to give men proof of his divinity, but because that was a part of his redemptive work.

2. **Scripture Promises of Healing.**—Divine healing and belief in its reality is reasonable on the ground of the divine promises which are expressed or implied in the Scriptures. These promises are of two main classes—general and specific. By general promises is meant those which promise whatever one may ask. The specific promises are those which offer healing especially on certain conditions. Examples of general promises are as follows: ''All things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive'' (Matt. 21:22). ''What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them'' (Mark 11:24). ''Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do'' (John 14:13). ''If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you'' (John 15:7). ''Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you'' (John 16:23). If these were the only promises of answer to prayer for the sick they alone would furnish sufficient ground for belief in divine healing.

The specific promises of healing are very definite. In the Great Commission as recorded by Mark, Jesus said that among other signs which should follow those who believe upon him, ''They shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover'' (Mark 16:18). The healing of the sick here promised was not to be through the apostles, but through those who believe of ''every creature'' to whom the apostles were commanded to preach. Both salvation and healing are included in the Great Commission. A question has sometimes been raised as to the genuineness of this verse, but it is found in all but one of the four oldest Greek manuscripts and is generally accepted by textual critics. Though Matthew's record of the Great Commission does not specifically promise healing, it is implied in the words ''teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.'' Jesus taught the apostles to pray for healing and here commanded them to teach others to do so, which implies his intention to answer such prayers.

The gifts of healing are represented in 1 Cor. 12:9-30 as

common in the church at the time Paul wrote. They are said to belong, not merely to apostles, but to whomsoever God might be pleased to give them. These gifts of healing imply the fact of healing. No promise of healing is more specific than that given in Jas. 5:14. "Is there any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him" (Jas. 5:14, 15). The power to heal is here said to belong, not merely to the apostles who were soon passing away, but to the elders of the church.

3. **The Divine Compassion.**—God is our father and we are his children. "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." What normal human father would fail to cure a suffering child if possible? It is possible for God to heal his children and it is reasonable to believe he will do so if they meet the proper conditions and he can do so consistently with their good otherwise. His interest in them is such that he has the very hairs of their heads all numbered (Matt. 10:30). And as he is mindful of the fall of the sparrow, he surely will help one of his suffering children who "are of more value than many sparrows." In view of his ability as Creator of all men, his benevolence, and his compassion, it is reasonable to expect him to heal the sick in answer to prayer. And devout persons do almost spontaneously pray to him for physical healing when sick.

III. Nature of Divine Physical Healing

1. **Definition of Divine Healing.**—Divine healing is physical healing by divine power directly manifested in answer to prayer and faith. Because God is the author of nature and imminent in nature and his power is back of all its operations, therefore all healing resulting from the processes of nature is in a sense divine healing mediately effected and one may properly give thanks to God for such healing. Though healing is through the use of natural remedies it may be attributed to God, who has created all those things and given them whatever qualities they possess that are efficacious in curing physical ailments.

But none of these natural processes are divine healing in

the sense of the Scriptures and as here used. Divine healing is not natural, but supernatural healing. It is a miraculous manifestation which transcends nature. Though it affects the material body, yet it is not by material means. As to its mode it is like the new birth of which Jesus said, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." And likewise mysterious is the mode of God in the work of supernatural healing. Rationalistic minds, who are ignorant of spiritual operations, persist in attempting to account for it on natural grounds, such as the power of mind over matter, or the result of an effort of the will. But they err by supplying in their own minds a motive or cause which does not exist. Those who have much experience in divine healing know that not infrequently the healing power comes upon the afflicted person while his mind and will are inactive or directed toward other things than his healing.

2. **God's Purpose in Healing.**—It has been commonly believed by Christians that the divine purpose in the miraculous healings described in the Scriptures was to show that Christianity is the true religion. This belief is correct as far as it goes. It was important that Christ should give clear evidence that he was the Son of God. Miraculous works of mercy in the healing of the suffering, the giving sight to those born blind, the healing of lepers, and of those hopelessly afflicted otherwise, were very convincing proof that he was of God. If he was of God his statements were credible. And if he furnished absolute proof that his statements were credible, men could properly do nothing else than believe his claim that he was the divine Son of God. When mighty healings were performed through the name of Jesus by the apostles they were shown to be men of God and their messages, messages of God. Here was evidence of the divine authority of Scriptures, or that they are a divine revelation. More than once did Jesus appeal to his healings as evidence that he was the Christ. The miracles of Jesus and those through the apostles did actually convince men at the time they were performed and have continued to convince men to the present time that Christianity is the true religion. There was special need of such attestation of the divinity of Jesus and of the fact that those were of God through whom Revelation was

given. But though the need does not exist in the same degree today, yet the need still exists of the evidence afforded by miracles that Christianity is of God. Skeptics are still being turned to faith by miracles as when Nicodemus said to Jesus, "No man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." Miracles also serve a valuable purpose today in confirming the faith of believers. Doubtless an important purpose of miracles is to help men's faith in God, but this is not the only purpose. Physical healings may have value as types of healing of spiritual ills, but this is not the primary purpose of divine healing.

Jesus healed the multitudes because "he was moved with compassion" for them. He is still as compassionate as at that time, and doubtless this is an important reason for his healing men's suffering bodies. God saves men because he loves them (John 3:16), and he heals them for a similar reason. Yet there are evidently various limitations on the manifestation of this divine compassion, for many sufferers are not cured. Why are some not healed? Evidently some are not healed because it is appointed unto man to die and the time has come when God wills that they depart from this life. Others are not healed because they fail to meet the proper conditions of faith and obedience. It is important to the glory of God and the well-being of men that healing be not dispensed unconditionally and indiscriminately. It is provided only on appropriate conditions as is salvation.

Though it is generally God's will to heal the sick, yet he is more concerned about men's spiritual and moral excellence than about their physical health; therefore God may try men through allowing them to remain afflicted for a period. In this particular, healing is not parallel with salvation. God's will is always to save the soul, but, though generally, not always to heal the body. Such a view does not ignore those promises of healing which in themselves offer healing to all. The promises of God are often limited or conditioned, not by any statement in immediate connection, but by statements elsewhere in the Bible. If this be not so, in view of Jas. 5:15, then, when a good man dies for whose healing prayer has been offered we are obliged to attribute the lack of healing to unbelief. But unbelief is displeasing to God; therefore one must either displease God to get to heaven or else certainly know God's will so he will not

ask for healing. It is better to regard God as having a will concerning us individually at the present time. We may properly believe on the ground of the Scriptures that it is ordinarily God's will to heal us and may pray for it unless it becomes manifest in some way that it is not his will. Healing may be withheld for a time as a test of faith or for some other wise reason. God may as properly try people by physical suffering as by other methods.

3. **God's Method of Healing.**—Any attempt fully to explain the mode of the divine operation in healing is necessarily fruitless. Every miracle is incomprehensible as to its mode. Divine healing is supernatural and the mode of it must be inscrutable to the human mind. It has already been stated that divine healing is not usually nor normally through natural processes or humanly applied means. Some persons testify to having prayed for relief in times of suffering and to having been divinely directed, as a consequence, to use certain means which effected their healing. Such testimonies are not incredible, especially in the case of persons who are not enlightened concerning their gospel privileges, but evidently this is not God's usual method of healing as set forth in the Scriptures.

God heals usually by a direct divine efficiency. As in the witness of the Spirit to us or the Spirit's communication of knowledge to us he usually does not employ our physical organs, but directly makes us conscious of that which he would have us know, so in healing God is not dependent upon any physical means or processes, but operates immediately in effecting health. As in the witness of the Spirit one suddenly finds himself in possession of a conviction that a particular thing is true, so when one is healed he suddenly becomes aware that he is well, but in neither instance is the mode comprehended.

Divine healing may be either instantaneous or gradual. It seems probable the healings recorded in the Bible were nearly all, if not all, instantaneous. Of all the healings described in the New Testament it can not be positively shown that any were accomplished gradually. Because those healings were described to show the power of God, it was important that only instantaneous healings be recorded. But the Bible does not state that God did not then or will not now sometimes heal gradually. Neither is there any rational ground for excluding gradual

healing by divine power. Many persons are so healed today in answer to prayer. This is reason enough for believing God will heal in this manner. To say an instance of healing is gradual is not to say it is indefinite or unreal. One may definitely begin to recover at a particular time from a disease of many years and in few days' time be completely restored. Such healings are not instantaneous, but gradual; yet they are real.

Also healing may be either partial or complete, or it may be either temporary or permanent and yet be genuine divine healing. Jesus once healed a blind man by two distinct stages. Not infrequently persons today receive partial healing in answer to prayer. Sometimes such persons receive complete healing later, in other instances they do not. Others are temporarily restored and soon after become afflicted again in the same manner. Doubtless much of such incomplete healing is due to unbelief. Many are instantly and completely healed today.

IV. Conditions for Healing

1. **Faith and Prayer.**—The conditions for healing are few and simple. The primary and all-important condition is faith. It was unbelief at Nazareth that hindered the performance of many mighty works there. The disciples failed to cure the demoniac son because of their unbelief. Jesus said to one who raised a question as to his ability, "If thou canst believe all things are possible to him that believeth." "The prayer of *faith* shall save the sick." The faith necessary to healing is not a mere theoretical or intellectual belief in God's power, but a trustful and confident stepping out on the divine promise as applying to the present need. It is a bold reliance upon God to heal a particular ailment at a particular time. Faith is not a mere arbitrary requirement for healing. Faith is that which connects the healing with God in the consciousness of him who prays. If healing were given by God without faith on the part of him who prays, the person would not have those feelings of gratitude which mean so much to his spiritual well-being and God's glory. Faith for healing is of the same essential nature and is necessary for the same reasons as is faith for other benefits in answer to prayer. Faith is necessary on the part of those who pray and also on the part of the sufferer unless he be for some reason disqualified to exercise faith.

Prayer is not essential to healing as is faith. Jesus and the apostles healed many through their word. Healings are sometimes so done today. The faith of an afflicted person may claim the promises of God and healing may be effected before sufficient time elapses for any formal praying. Yet prayer is a Biblical condition for healing. "What things soever ye desire, when ye *pray,* believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them" (Mark 11:24). "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them *pray* over him . . . and the *prayer* of faith shall save the sick" (Jas. 5:14, 15). Prayer has much the same value as does faith in relating the healing to the healer in the consciousness of the one who prays, and is also a help to the exercise of faith. The effectual prayer is a fervent prayer. Sometimes healing is obtained only after much persistence in prayer. Such continuance in prayer is Scriptural (Luke 11:5-13).

2. **Anointing with Oil and Laying on of Hands.**—The classical text on divine healing is Jas. 5:13-18. There the elders are commanded to anoint the sick with oil in the name of the Lord and pray over him. Such anointing was practised by Jesus' disciples in their healing of the sick. "And they went out, and preached that men should repent. And they cast out many devils, and *anointed with oil* many that were sick, and healed them" (Mark 6:12, 13). What is the purpose of this anointing of the sick with oil? Evidently the oil in itself has no curative value when merely poured upon the head. Olive-oil was that commonly used for purposes of anointing. In special instances a costly perfume was used either mixed with the oil or alone as in the anointing of Jesus at Bethany. But in no case did the oil possess special healing properties. Anointing was common in the Old Testament days. Aaron was inducted into the high priestly office by the process of anointing. In like manner Saul and David were appointed king over Israel. Oil is represented in the Scriptures as symbolic of the Holy Spirit. When David was anointed the Spirit of God came upon him from that day forward. The anointing of the sick with oil has the significance of the Spirit and power of God coming upon them to heal them. It is a very apt symbol and is therefore helpful to the faith of those afflicted. It is also an act of obedience, the practise of which helps to give definiteness and strength to one's faith.

Similar in its purpose to anointing of the sick is the laying on of the hands of those who pray for the healing of the sick. Jesus and the apostles often laid their hands upon the sick or touched them as a means to their healing. One of the signs which Jesus said should follow those who believe was that "they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover" (Mark 16: 18). By the act of laying on of hands by those who are called to pray for the sick there is a symbolic conveying of divine power much as there was a giving of the Holy Ghost by the laying of the apostles' hands upon believers. There is no reason for believing the power of God is actually transmitted by the laying on of hands or that it might not come upon the sick person as well without this physical contact. But as a symbolic transmitting of divine power to the body of the suffering one, it has much value in assisting him to believe, and in making real to his consciousness the fact of the divine operation in his healing. Symbols have always had a big place in true religion and do have in the Christian religion, especially in the established ordinances. They are valuable even to the most devout and intelligent persons because of inability of men in their present state fully to comprehend the reality of spiritual operations.

The anointing of the sick with oil is directed to be performed by the elders especially. Yet the Scriptures do not limit it to them or state that others shall not do it. Naturally they are ordinarily best qualified to do this service because of being more advanced in the religious life and as the divinely constituted leaders in the congregation. The laying on of hands for the recovery of the sick is said to be by those who "believe." It is a proper function for the elders to perform in connection with anointing with oil. But inasmuch as one who is not an elder may have the gift of healing, according to 1 Corinthians 12, there is reason to allow that all such may properly anoint and lay hands upon the sick for their healing.

3. **Attitude Toward Human Remedies.**—Does divine healing exclude all human effort for the healing of the sick? If not, to what extent may the sick consistently employ natural means for their relief while they are trusting God to heal them? Doubtless two extremes are possible in relation to these questions. Some pray for God to heal them while their faith is in natural remedies. Others suppose trust in God bars observance of well-known

laws of health. Certainly God needs no natural means to bless in effecting men's healing. Jesus and the apostles used none. Divine healing is by spiritual power alone without natural remedies.

The Bible incidentally refers to the inefficacy of human methods of healing in comparison with healing by divine power. It does not state nor imply that the efforts of physicians and the use of medicine are displeasing to God. Divine healing is so represented that it is evident it is far superior to human methods of healing. God offers divine healing, but does not require that men accept it. In other words, the Scriptures do not teach that the employment of human methods is sinful. But that it is far better in every respect to be healed by direct divine power than to trust in the many uncertain human methods must be apparent to all. The devout person who is enlightened will naturally prefer to trust in God. Because of the limitations of human wisdom and the uncertainty of the effects of many human remedies, there is necessarily an element of danger in their use. Also the fact that these remedies often fail to cure is strong reason for trusting in the power of the Almighty. Another advantage of being healed by God is the spiritual blessings that it entails.

Yet there is a place for physicians and human remedies. Many sick persons who are outside of Christ or who are without knowledge of their privilege of being divinely cured or for other reasons lack faith to trust in God need the help of skilled physicians. It is unbecoming to those who trust in God for healing to despise or oppose physicians. Many excellent Christian men are engaged in the medical profession and are earnestly endeavoring to benefit suffering humanity. Such should be respected accordingly. They have done much by their surgical skill and by discovering and making known the laws of health to benefit humanity. There is not necessarily incompatibility between their work and prayer for the sick. Especially when they found they could give no relief to the sick, devout physicians have recommended prayer. Doubtless their services are desirable in case of serious wounds, the loss of a limb, adjustment of fractures or dislocation of bones, or at child-birth.

It has been the experience of many that to the extent their reliance upon God for healing was weak to that extent they

used and trusted in human means. This is usually so. Often not until a definite decision has been made to discontinue the use of medicines has an effective reliance on God's promises been possible. But how far one may go consistently with faith in God in assisting nature by regulation of diet, employment of various appliances, and other remedial efforts is not stated in the Scriptures. It is a matter to be determined by the judgment and conscience of the one concerned. The Bible has drawn no fine line as to limitations in such instances, and it is useless for men to attempt drawing such a line. These principles should govern our attitude, not only towards the use of medicines, but also towards the employment of chiropractors, osteopaths, and similar human means of healing.

V. Objections to Divine Healing

Some objections to divine healing are made by unbelievers who are sometimes more interested in vindicating their unbelief than in discovering truth. Many of their objections are unworthy of being answered and require no answer for fair-minded persons. Of other objections many have been answered in the foregoing discussion. The objection that the age of miracles is past has already been answered. The objection has also been met that the healings described in the Bible were performed only for proof that Christianity is of God and their continuance is no longer needed.

1. **That It Is Similar to Spiritualistic Healing.**—Not infrequently the objection is made to divine healing that it is similar in certain respects to the practises of Spiritualism, animal magnetism, clairvoyance, etc. It is useless to deny that spiritualistic mediums exercise supernatural power in some instances, whatever degree of fraud they may practise at other times. Evidently they accomplish healings. But these are done by the "spirits of devils working miracles." The power which operates in modern spiritualism is identical with that of Egyptian magicians, the Greek oracle, and the medicine-men of savage peoples. Spiritualists perform healings without material remedies by spiritual power and in this their healing is similar to divine healing. But must the genuine be given up because it has been counterfeited? Is divine healing not more important in order to keep

men from being deceived by the devil? This objection is invalid against the practise of divine healing.

2. **That There Are Failures in Divine Healing.**—Instances of failure of persons to be healed for whom prayer has been offered is supposed by some to be a valid objection to divine healing. But if such an objection may properly be made to divine healing, surely there is much ground for objection to medical healing or healing by any other human method. An objection might as well be made to regeneration on the ground that some who pray for it fail to obtain it. The possibility of divine healing is undeniably proved by the many instances of real healing. No failures constitute any valid ground for objection to healing through prayer in view of these. As already shown, the failure to receive healing when prayer is offered may be due to unbelief, to disobedience, or to a lack of persistence or earnestness in praying; or it may be because it is God's will that the sick person should die, or because God is pleased that his faith should be temporarily tested in this way for his spiritual good. But failure of healing on any of these grounds is no argument against divine healing. Especially if it is not God's will that one should recover, no amount of medicine will cure.

Another class of objections made to divine healing on the ground of failure is the sickness of Epaphroditus and Trophimus, Paul's thorn in the flesh, and Paul's recommendation of wine to Timothy for his stomach's sake and because of his often infirmities. Paul tells us Epaphroditus was recovered from his affliction and there is no room to believe Trophimus was not healed, their failure may have been due to one of the beforementioned causes, in which case there could be no reflection on the efficacy of divine healing. The "messenger of Satan" sent to buffet Paul which he also designates "a thorn in the flesh" can not be proved to have been of the nature of disease or physical weakness. It was for the purpose of keeping him from becoming "exalted above measure" because of the abundance of revelations which God had given him. For other reasons and also because it was designed to keep him humble, not a few have supposed his "thorn in the flesh" was his physical sufferings through persecution and hardship for the sake of the gospel. But whatever it may have been, there is no proof it was of the nature of sickness; therefore it furnishes no ground for objec-

tion to divine healing. It is evident from Paul's words that Timothy was troubled with frequent illness, probably as a consequence of a weakness of the stomach. Paul's fatherly interest in his young and less experienced associate led him to advise Timothy that the water where he was then located was harmful to his health and he should therefore use wine moderately instead. The recommendation had to do with diet rather than remedy. But surely these words of Paul furnish no proper ground for objection to the doctrine of divine healing.

3. **That God Created Herbs for Medicine.**—We readily admit that those things of which medicine is made were created by God. But where is the proof that God created these for the purpose of the manufacture of medicine? Not a few men of the medical profession have questioned the value of drugs as a means of curing disease. This lack of efficiency of drugs as remedies for disease is reason for doubt that their use for that purpose is divinely intended. The Scriptures nowhere say they shall not be so used by those who desire them, but the Scriptures do offer a better means of healing as God's way, and devout persons who are enlightened as to their gospel privileges will usually choose to trust in God for their healing rather than in any of the uncertain human methods.

PART VI

THE CHURCH, OR ECCLESIOLOGY

PART VI

THE CHURCH, OR ECCLESIOLOGY

CHAPTER I

ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH

I. Idea of the Church

1. **Sense of the Term.**—The word "church" is the rendering in the common English version of the New Testament of the Greek term ἐκκλησία (*ecclesia*). The sense of the English term "church" in the New Testament is determined wholly by the meaning of the Greek ἐκκλησία (*ecclesia*). The latter is derived from a compound term, ἐκ-καλέω (*ek-kaleo*), the latter part meaning to *call* and the former meaning *out of*. Ecclesia, therefore denotes an assembly summoned or called out, a company selected or separated from the multitude. Before it was used of the Christian assembly it had a secular usage of the assembly of the citizens of a Greek city when summoned by the crier. Trench says, "*Ecclesia,* as all know, was the lawful assembly in a free Greek city of all those possessed of the right of citizenship for the transaction of public affairs. That they were *summoned* is expressed in the latter part of the word; that they were summoned *out of* the whole population, a select portion of it, neither the populace, nor yet strangers, nor those who had forfeited their civil rights—this is expressed in the first. Both the *calling* and the calling *out* are moments to be remembered when the word is assumed into a higher Christian sense; for in them the chief part of its adaptation to its more august use lies." Not a mere mob, but only an assembly summoned together was an ecclesia.

The Hebrew word which is rendered "congregation" in the common English version, as in the expression "congregation of the Lord," is in the Greek Septuagint rendered ἐκκλησία (*ecclesia*). The Hebrew church were the descendants of Israel, and were divinely called out from among the nations to be the special people of God.

In the New Testament *ecclesia* is found one hundred and fifteen times. In three instances it is used of the Greek assembly,

as in Acts 19:32, 39, where it is translated "assembly"; two times it is used of the Hebrew congregation (Acts 7:38 and Heb. 2:12) and translated "church"; and one hundred and ten times it is used of the Christian church. In this latter use it refers to those whom God has called or chosen out from the world. The church of God, then, is simply the company of God's called-out ones. The sense of the term *ecclesia* is of much value in furnishing us a correct idea of what is the true church.

2. **The Universal Church.**—Ἐκκλησία (*Ecclesia*), in its broadest sense, is used of the entire company of those whom God has called in all ages whether they be on earth or in heaven. It consists of the aggregate of those who have been regenerated. In this sense the church is but one and is so often represented in the Scriptures. Jesus said, "I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18). The singular number here indicates that the universal church is spoken of. "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church" (Eph. 5:25-27). Evidently the local church can not be represented here as the bride of Christ, else innumerable brides will at last be presented to Christ, a figure which is entirely incongruous. When the church is represented as the body of Christ only the universal church can be meant. Christ is "Head over all things to the church, which is his body" (Eph. 1:22). In Romans 12 and 1 Corinthians 12 the physical human body is used to represent the body of Christ. Of this body Christ is said to be the head. But if the body of Christ were used of the local church, then we have the image of one head with innumerable bodies. Other texts in which ecclesia is used in the universal sense are, "He is the head of the body, the church" (Col. 1:18); "For his body's sake, which is the church" (v. 24); also Eph. 3:10, 21 and Heb. 12:23. In this general aspect the church is sometimes described as invisible. It is so designated because it has no visible or earthly organization as do local congregations with their meetings and elders, or as do humanly organized denominational churches. This designation does not imply that the universal church is not truly organized with a divine spiritual head to which every member is related. The universal church is not merely the aggregate of all who profess Christianity, but is that company whom

Christ has regenerated, in whom his Spirit dwells, and who are thereby joined to Christ and to one another.

3. **The Local Church.**—Ἐκκλησία (*ecclesia*) is also used in the Scriptures of the local congregation. This is its most common sense, being so used in ninety-two instances. Examples of this usage are, "the church which was at Jerusalem" (Acts 8:1), "the churches of Galatia" (1 Cor. 16:1), and "the church of God which is at Corinth" (1 Cor. 1:2). The local church is the local embodiment and exhibition of the universal church. It is the company of the regenerate persons of a given community associated together according to the Scriptures for worship and the upbuilding of the kingdom of God. It is not merely an association of persons who have joined themselves together for social, benevolent, or even a religious purpose. A true local church is divinely organized in the sense that it is composed of those who are saved, who all have the same Spirit, and who are all joined to the living Head of the body. Their association and fellowship together is on the basis of this spiritual relationship divinely effected, and by the members' recognition of one another as being so related.

Ἐκκλησία (*ecclesia*) is also used to designate the whole body of disciples or of local churches in a particular region, as in Acts 9:31, "So the church throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria had peace" (R. V.). In this use it seems to have a meaning identical with that of the universal church and applies in that sense to the Christians of that region. There is no evidence that the churches in those regions were bound together by any outward organization which differentiated them from other parts of the universal church. The term "church" is used at the present day of humanly organized denominational institutions, which usage is doubtless in accordance with the original sense of ἐκκλησία (*ecclesia*), but is entirely without Scriptural support.

4. **Relation of the Church and God's Kingdom.**—Predictions of a coming kingdom of God are common in the Old Testament prophets. Jesus came announcing that the time was fulfilled and the establishment of that kingdom was at hand. He said much in his teaching about the kingdom. Those who are subjects of the spiritual kingdom of God and the membership of the church in its universal aspect, are identical, including all of

God's children. In the Gospels this spiritual society is called the "kingdom," and is so designated one hundred and twelve times, while the term "church" is used in but two instances. A reverse usage characterizes the epistles, "church" being mentioned one hundred and twelve times, and the "kingdom" twenty-nine times.

Though the membership composing the kingdom and the church are identical, yet the two terms are not entirely identical in meaning, but represent different phases of that spiritual society. The term "kingdom" describes that society in relation to Christ, who rules over it. The term "ecclesia" emphasizes another aspect of it—the relationship of its members to one another as an assembly, or a spiritual brotherhood. In either the kingdom or the church all are included who have been regenerated. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3:5). The new birth also inducts men into the family of God, which is the church (1 Tim. 3:15).

II. The Fact of Its Organization

1. **Theories of the Time of Its Organization.**—Did Jesus intend that those who accepted his teaching should be joined together in a society, or was it rather his intention that the principles he propounded should result merely in the transformation of the lives of those who accepted them? If he intended that his followers should be associated in an organization, when and by what authority was such organization effected? Those who deny the divine inspiration and unity of the Scriptures sometimes set the teachings of Jesus over against those of the writers of the epistles and affirm that Jesus did not intend an association of his followers, but that this idea first arose among his disciples subsequently to his death. Some other religious teachers of the post-Reformation period, failing to distinguish between the local and universal aspects of the church, have rejected as unscriptural the idea of an organized church. Three principal theories have prevailed as to the time of the organization of the church and the authority to organize it.

The first theory denies that the church was organized during the apostolic period, affirming it existed only in germ then and was fully organized only during the patristic period or the first six Christian centuries. It assumes the Church Fathers were

inspired equally with the apostles in their teaching and acts, and that therefore the organization they effected was according to the will of God. It is the theory of an inspired church of Romanism, but has been inconsistently held by the Anglican Church. The theory is objectionable for different reasons. (1) The Scriptures clearly teach that the church was fully organized during the apostolic period. God intended that it should be increased in membership, but not that its form should be changed. (2) The form of organization varied greatly during the patristic period, from the simple local congregations of the second century with their elders and deacons, to the fully developed hierarchy of the fifth century with its metropolitans, diocesan bishops, and priests of lower orders. The latter could not have been a natural development from the former. A new principle of organization was introduced. (3) If the form of the organization of the church was to be decided by men after the apostolic period on the theory that those men were inspired as were the apostles, then there is no logical reason for assuming that such inspiration ceased with the patristic period. Consistency required the acceptance of the Romish doctrine of an inspired church to supplement and interpret the Biblical revelation in all ages. But all Protestants properly reject such a doctrine and accept the Scriptures alone as divine revelation for mankind.

The second theory of the authority for church organization is that God has not given and does not require a particular form of organization of his church, but that it is entirely a matter of expediency to be determined by the particular conditions and needs of a community of Christians. This is the theory held by most of the Protestant denominations. It is unsound because it ignores the fact that Jesus organized his church during his personal ministry and through his especially inspired apostles. As the form of civil government is determinative of its effects on the life of the nation, so the form of church organization effects the sentiments and character of the members. The apostasy of the early church was not first in false doctrinal statements, but in unscriptural church organization.

The third conception as to the authority in church organization and the time of it is that the church was organized by divine authority, its form being determined by Jesus and his divinely

25.398

inspired apostles, during the first century. No man may properly attempt to change or set aside that form which was then given.

2. **The Fact Stated and Implied in the Bible.**—That Jesus intended to build a church he clearly stated in the words, "I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18). During his personal ministry he regenerated those who believed on him. In regeneration they were all made to possess the one divine Spirit by which they became related to one another as members of the spiritual body of Christ and to him as its head. This was organization. Shortly after the foregoing words of Jesus were spoken the church was frequently mentioned by the inspired writers as already existing (Acts 5:11; 8:1; 11:26). Much is said of it as an existing institution in the epistles. The day of Pentecost is often pointed to as the time of the organization of the church. Viewed as a body of people brought together through the operation of the Holy Spirit and for the first time established in definite church relationship, this is true. But the church existed in embryonic form, we may say, before Pentecost, for it is certain that men pressed into the kingdom of God from the days of John the Baptist. "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it" (Luke 16:16). Membership in the kingdom and church are identical, the result of regeneration; therefore during Christ's personal ministry men were becoming members of the church, the universal body of Christ, although as yet that body was not exhibited to the world in concrete, organic form.

But in the apostolic period, from Pentecost on, there was not only an organization of the spiritual body or universal church, but the local churches were also organized. This is implied by many statements and allusions of the Scriptures concerning the affairs of those congregations. They had stated meetings (Acts 20:7; Heb. 10:25). They had elections (Acts 6:5; 2 Cor. 8:19). They had officers, bishops and deacons (Acts 20:17; Phil. 1:1). They had government (1 Tim. 5:17; Heb. 13:17). They had a recognized membership (Acts 4:23; 1 Cor. 11:33). They gave congregational contributions (Rom. 15:26; 1 Cor. 16:1). They kept a register of widows (1 Tim. 5:9). They exercised discipline (1 Cor. 5:13; 2 Cor. 7:11). All of these are impossible without a measure of organization. However, organiza-

tion does not necessarily require written records, lists of members, formal choice of officers, or formal accepting of members. Neither must we assume that the local churches were fully organized in all these respects from their beginning at Jerusalem. The New Testament record rather leads to the belief that the completed form of their organization was gradually attained as the need arose. Yet they were organized under the guidance of divinely inspired apostles through whom also the Scriptures were given. As doctrinal truth was gradually revealed as occasion required, so was the organization of the church gradually effected as the need for it arose.

3. **Figurative Representations of the Church.**—The fact of the organization of the church is definitely implied in the principal figures used of it. In Romans 12 and 1 Corinthians 12 it is represented as being like the physical human body. Individual Christians are described as being workers together and helpers in the work of the body as are the eye, the hand, or the foot in the human body. Nothing can be more nearly parallel to the spiritual body of Christ than is the physical body with its several members in which one spirit dwells and over which it rules so they function together in absolute harmony.

The church is also represented under the figure of a house or building (1 Tim. 3:15). In it God's people are described as "lively stones" "built up a spiritual house" (1 Pet. 2:5). They are said to be "framed together" and "builded together for an habitation of God" (Eph. 2:21, 22). To build together is to organize. Therefore the church is organized. It is also represented by other figures which imply it is organized, as a flock under one shepherd (John 10), and a city (Heb. 12:22), and a family (Eph. 3:15).

III. Nature of Its Organization

1. **Different Forms of Church Organization.**—Among the various denominational churches four distinct forms of organization are found. They may be described as (1) monarchical, (2) oligarchical, (3) republican, and (4) democratic; or they may be more specifically designated respectively as the papal, episcopal, presbyterial, and congregational.

Monarchical government is a rule by one alone who has supreme power to legislate and act in all the functions of the government. The Roman Catholic Church, with its pope, who

assumes to be infallible, is the principal representative of this form of church government. However, certain smaller and more recent bodies have practically, if not professedly, been so governed. The oligarchical is a government by a few. Episcopal church government is of this class in that the authority resides in the bishops, a self-perpetuating body which is distinct from and virtually independent of the local congregation. The bishops are a class of higher clergy who exercise authority over the elders and deacons. Examples of this form of church organization are the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States especially, and also the Methodist Episcopal Church in certain of its aspects. A republican government is one in which the ruling power is vested in representatives elected by the people. The government of the Presbyterian Church is of this class. The congregation elects the pastor and elders who compose the session, delegates from several sessions compose the presbytery, delegates from the several presbyteries compose the synod, and delegates from these synods constitute the general assembly, which is the supreme authority. It is a form of government built upon the principle of representation. A democratic government in the strict sense is one in which the whole body of the people rule themselves directly. The congregational form of church government is of this type. No power is recognized as superior to that of the local church. This necessarily excludes any larger organization than that of the local congregation. Examples of this form of church organization are the Independents of England, the Congregational churches in the United States, and the Baptist churches generally.

All these forms of church organization and government are self-consistent, but they all proceed on a purely human basis. Because the New Testament church is divinely organized and ruled none of the foregoing systems can of themselves be that set forth in the Scriptures.

2. **The Church Divinely Organized.**—Any true idea of the form and nature of the organization of the New Testament church must agree with all the New Testament statements bearing on the subject. It is important that we avoid stressing one aspect of its organization set forth in a particular text of Scripture to the exclusion of another aspect represented in other

texts. No truth concerning the true church is more certainly taught in the Bible than that it is divinely organized. In his first mention of the church, Jesus said, "I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18). This is equal to our saying the church of Christ has been divinely organized. It is his because he built it. To organize is to induct and relate the members of a whole to one another and to it. The addition of members was not only divinely accomplished in the original constitution of the church, but such was the only mode of induction subsequently. "By one Spirit are we all baptized [inducted] into one body" (1 Cor. 12:13). "But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him" (v. 18). Regeneration is the method by which the Spirit of God inducts or sets members in the church. If the church is composed of the entire company of the regenerate and is the family of God, as we have defined it to be, in the very nature of things it must be divinely organized in respect to its membership.

But there is also another aspect of organization of the church—the constituting of officers in it. The first preachers of the gospel were divinely called and qualified for their sacred work (Mark 3:14). As much may be said of the apostle Paul (Gal. 1:1). All other ministers of Christ are likewise divinely appointed. "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues" (1 Cor. 12:28). The sense of this entire twelfth chapter is that men do their particular work in the church because of spiritual gifts which they have received of God. Elders do not have gifts because they are elders, but are elders because their divinely given gifts constitute them such. The same truth is taught in Eph. 4: "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. . . . And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers" (vs. 8, 11). With such a sense of the constituting of men officers in the true church it is apparent that only God can make one an officer. Therefore the church is divinely organized both as to the induction of members and the constitution of officers. What is here stated pertains to the universal church, but these divine operations are also the ground of all local church organization.

3. **The Human Agency in Church Organization.**—A human agency must be recognized in the organization of the local congregation. The proofs already given that it was an organized body imply that it had a definite membership which was known as such to the members. This is true of the local church as it can not be of the universal church. What, then, is the human function in relation to the organization of the local congregation. In seeking to determine this it is necessary to avoid any view that conflicts with the fundamental truth already shown to be clearly set forth in the Scriptures—that the church is divinely organized. If the universal church is divinely organized, the local church, which is but a part of it, must be also divinely organized. But if God organizes the local church, then it is not organized by men. If God constitutes men officers, other men can do no more than recognize what God has done. If God makes men members by miraculously converting them, other members can do no more than recognize such as fellow members of the church. The association, then, of members of the universal church in the local congregation involves on their part the principle of recognition as to the human connection with church organization. Men recognize what God has done. The recognition of elders seems to have been by a formal process of laying on of hands and prayer in ordination. But there is no proof that members were recognized or accepted by congregations by any formal process or official act.

All the saved and only the saved in a particular community are properly members of the local congregation. Normally the recognized membership of the local congregation is identical with the number of the saved in a particular locality. But because of human fallibility, either on the part of the individual in knowing his duty of associating himself with a local church or on the part of the congregation in discerning who are saved and who are not, error is possible even in the most spiritual church. Examples of this are the recognition for a time of two false members, Ananias and Sapphira, by the church in Jerusalem; of Simon the Sorcerer by the church of Samaria; of certain unworthy persons by the church at Corinth; and of an unworthy member, by the name of Diotrephes, who loved to have the preeminence, by a church which John mentioned. Yet God is pleased that mistakes in accepting unworthy persons should

be rectified. When Peter discerned that Ananias and Sapphira were dishonest, or when he found Simon desiring to purchase the gift of God with money, he promptly rejected them. Paul likewise urged the Corinthians to dissociate themselves from those among them who walked disorderly.

But there is a possibility of a local church failing to accept one whom God has accepted. This was true of the church at Jerusalem in relation to Paul when he returned to them after his conversion at Damascus and endeavored to join himself to them. Only when he was especially recommended to them by Barnabas did they accept him.

But there is yet another aspect of the human agency in the organization of the local church to be considered. Because of the social aspect of such an organization it follows that he who is to be recognized by a congregation as one of its members must first have intentions of associating himself with them. Paul "assayed to join himself to the disciples" at Jerusalem. Only when one voluntarily associates himself with a local church as a member and is accepted or recognized as such by that church can he properly be said to be a member, even though he be saved and a resident of the immediate community where that church meets. This may be shown by a few examples. Suppose three men are converted in a revival-meeting at a certain local church. The minister urges their regular attendance at the services. But the first states he is a resident of another city and will worship with the local church of God in the city where he resides. The second, though truly converted, is untaught religiously and therefore states he will worship at the Roman Catholic Church where his family are members. The third agrees to worship with the congregation where he was converted, which he does and is recognized by the congregation there as one of their number. Evidently the first two men are not members of that congregation even though it much desires to accept them as such. The membership of the third man in that congregation is determined by his definitely associating himself with them and their recognition of him as one of them, even though neither the associating nor the recognizing is by a formal act. Or as a further example, let us suppose a Christian man moves into a certain city where there are two local churches of God. Though he lives much nearer to the first, yet he always worships

at the second because his presence is more needed there. He not only associates himself with that church as a member, but they recognize him as such. No recognition of him as a member on the part of the first church could constitute him a member there as long as he associates himself with the other congregation. Every Christian is a member of the universal church, but not of every local congregation. But no one is *properly* a member of a local congregation who is not a member of the universal church. The latter is the ground for the former.

IV. Organization of Operative Agencies

1. **Operative Agencies Needed in the Church.**—With a well-developed state of society and an elaborately organized government as was that of Imperial Rome, it is not surprizing that associations of various kinds should have been prevalent in the first Christian century. According to writers of that period associations were common in every aspect of life as among civilized peoples today. Cooperation among many requires such organizations. The early churches found need of cooperation to accomplish certain results and a consequent need of the organization of agencies to represent the whole church in those endeavors. The church at Jerusalem had certain financial administrations to be cared for. On the recommendation of the apostles they proceeded in an orderly manner to elect seven properly qualified men as a financial committee to attend to this business (Acts 6). Other examples are the committee sent by the church at Antioch to Jerusalem to inquire of the apostles there concerning the observance of the law (Acts 15:2), or the committee appointed by the Gentile churches to bear their gift to the poor saints at Jerusalem (1 Cor. 16:3; 2 Cor. 8:19, 23). In the brief and partial history given in the New Testament of the apostolic church but few instances are mentioned of the organization of such committees, but from what is stated it is evident the churches organized them whenever they were needed for the efficient prosecution of the work, and such agencies were probably common.

Every local congregation will find need of organizing such agencies as the field of its operation broadens. As new branches of work are undertaken more and more elaborate agencies of this sort will be needed. If the local church property is to be

held and controlled by the whole congregation, as it should be, there must be trustees duly appointed in an orderly and legal manner. If benevolent work among the poor is to be done by the church in an efficient manner a duly appointed committee must be given the responsibility of collecting and disbursing such funds. If the local church is to undertake systematic religious educational work, by way of a Sunday-school or otherwise, efficiency demands an organization sufficient to insure orderliness in the school and in the curriculum. Besides regular operative organizations in the local church there will be need of the appointment of special agencies for special operations such as the erection of a church edifice. The larger the number of units cooperating, the greater the need of the organizing of representative agencies. When the local churches of a region or of an entire country undertake cooperative effort they have special need of agencies through which to operate. Missionary societies organized by and representative of the local churches of the country are examples of such general agencies. As surely as the Jerusalem church needed the financial committee composed of the seven, and even more surely, if many individual Christians and several congregations are efficiently to cooperate in the supporting of missionaries to unevangelized regions, the constituting of such an agency is imperative. These organizations should be constituted by all those whom they represent or by representatives of the latter. Similar general church agencies are needed for the publication of religious literature, the conducting of schools for the training of ministers, and the controlling of church property used for general church gatherings.

2. **Relation of These Agencies to the Church.**—But what is the nature of these agencies and their relationship to the organization of the church? The distinction is clear between the organization *of* the church and organizations effected *by* the church. The distinction is similar to the difference between the relationship between members of a human family and a business organization effected by the members of that family. It is true that when a local church engages in appointing such an agency it must resolve itself into a deliberative body, and it may for good reason not extend the franchise at such times to some who are truly members of the church if its interests require discrimina-

tion in this connection against some because of youthfulness or for other reasons. For this reason it can not be said that the local church in the full sense organizes itself for business.

Operative agencies should be organized only as they are needed to accomplish the work of the church. They are not an end in themselves, but a means to an end. Therefore they should be no more elaborate than the need requires.

CHAPTER II

GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH

I. Officers of the Church

The church is represented as having various classes of officers who are its overseers and who are said in some sense to rule over it. Our views of the government of the church are determined in a measure by what the functions of those officers are found to be.

1. **Classes of Officers.**—The officers of the New Testament church are described as being of different classes. Of Christ it is said, "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry" (Eph. 4:11, 12). In writing to the Philippians the Apostle mentions their officers as "bishops and deacons" (Phil. 1:1). Also he so designates them in 1 Tim. 3:1-13. Here are at least six different classes of church officers. These may be classified as extraordinary and ordinary. The former class are those whose labors do not require that they be associated with a particular congregation, but whose work may be intercongregational or apart from local congregations entirely. The latter class, the ordinary officers, are those who are necessary to the proper organization of the local church. The extraordinary officers consist of apostles, prophets, evangelists, and may include teachers.

The apostles were originally twelve in number, probably to correspond to the twelve tribes of Israel, to whom they were originally and especially sent. Matthias was only the successor of Judas Iscariot. Paul was later added as a thirteenth apostle whose special duty was to carry the gospel to the Gentiles. In defending his apostolic authority the apostle Paul represents certain qualifications as necessary to those who fill the office. An apostle must have been sent forth by Christ in person (Acts 1:24; Gal. 1:1). He must have seen the Lord in person after he was raised from the dead in order that he may be a witness to that great truth (Acts 1:22, 23; 1 Cor. 9:1). He must have received the gospel directly from Christ without any human intervention (Gal. 1:11-20). To these thirteen apostles of Christ was committed the responsibility of the original establish-

ment of the church and of Christianity. Their office was peculiar to them and had a special purpose. When they had accomplished that purpose the office ceased with their death. Because the office was not perpetuated, there is no ground for the assumption that prelatic bishops are the successors of the apostles. It is true the term "apostle" is used in a lower sense of those who first carry the gospel message to a non-Christian people. The original meaning of the term "apostle" is one sent forth, as an ambassador is sent by a ruler to be his representative to another nation. The original apostles were peculiar in that they were sent to plant Christianity in the whole world. But those who first carry the Christian religion to non-Christian countries are properly called apostles in a secondary sense of the term. All pioneer missionaries are apostles in this sense. But in such a sense of apostle no distinct office in the church is designated.

Prophets of the apostolic church sometimes predicted future events as did those of ancient Israel. Agabus was especially used in such prediction (Acts 11:28; 21:11). But the chief function of the New Testament prophets was to speak the message of God under the special inspiration of the Holy Spirit. They spoke "unto men to edification, exhortation, and comfort."

Their function was principally that of preaching. A special need of the revelation of truth through such specially inspired men was important before the New Testament Scriptures were given as it is not to us who have the full revelation of the Scriptures; yet there is no proper ground for saying this office ceased with the Apostolic Age, for there is doubtless a need for its exercise at present as for other supernatural manifestations.

Evangelists are itinerant ministers or missionaries. Apostles in the secondary sense may be included in this class, though all evangelists may not properly be called apostles in the lower sense. Evangelists are men who have been called to the gospel ministry, but who are without a permanent local charge and who travel from place to place preaching for short intervals to establish congregations or endeavoring to convert men by preaching the gospel where no congregations exist. Though the word is found but three times in the New Testament (Acts 21:8; 2 Tim. 4:5; Eph. 4:11), yet the names of several are men-

tioned who were evidently evangelists, such as Philip, Timothy, Titus, Silas, Apollos, and Luke. Some of these traveled or cooperated with the apostle Paul. The office of evangelist is permanent in the church.

Teachers are ministers who exercise a special function of instructing men in the truths of religion. The purpose of teaching is to enlighten the intellect rather than especially to move men to action. This is an important office. Jesus occupied himself largely with "teaching" the people, as is stated and as is evident from the nature of his recorded discourses. There were those in the apostolic churches who had special gifts for such work and they may or may not represent a distinct class in the ministry. Teaching appears to be a function of the pastor in Eph. 4:11, but a distinct office in Rom. 12:7. A pastor or evangelist may be a teacher as an apostle may be a pastor or evangelist.

The ordinary or regular officers of the church may be properly designated as (1) elders, bishops, or pastors, and (2) deacons. The qualifications of these are especially enumerated in the pastoral epistles. Paul recognizes them as distinct classes in writing to the Philippians. "To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons" (1:1).

2. **Pastors, or Bishops.**—The preachers, or leaders of the local churches, are designated by various terms in the New Testament, as elders, bishops, or pastors. All three of these terms are used of the same office. This is denied by prelatists, who in addition to elders and deacons, the two classes of church officers recognized by others, distinguish a third and higher class of officers in their bishops. On what ground does prelacy make such a distinction? If the distinction between elders and bishops does not rest on Biblical grounds, do the Scriptures afford proof that they are identical? These questions lead us to inquire concerning the usage of the original terms.

Of the two terms, "elder" and "bishop," by far the more common is the former, which is the English rendering of the Greek, πρεσβύτερος (*presbuteros*). It is used with reference to church officers thirty-one times and by five different writers in the New Testament, while the term ἐπίσκοπος (*episkopos*), bishop, is found but six times. Therefore the preponderance of the use of the former over the latter is great. Elder is a Jewish term of Greek derivation. The Jews used it of the officers of

their synagogs. The use of the term "elder" by the apostolic congregations to designate their leaders was very natural, due to the first Christian assemblies and the apostles themselves being Jewish. It was the most expressive term the language afforded. It was used of all preachers, even of the apostles themselves. They so apply it to themselves in three instances (1 Pet. 5:11; 2 John 1; 3 John 1). Whatever may have been a preacher's particular kind of ministry, whether apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor, or teacher, he was an elder, or presbyter, which is merely the anglicized form of the Greek term πρεσβύτερος (*presbuteros*). Elder indicates the rank of the office, while other terms such as evangelist, pastor, teacher, and also bishop denote particular functions connected with it.

The term "bishop" is the rendering of the Greek ἐπίσκοπος (*episkopos*) and means overseer. It is so translated in Acts 20: 28. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers* [ἐπισκόπους (*episkopous*)]," or bishops. There is no record of its use by the apostolic church of its ministers until a comparatively late date. Its earliest use is in the preceding quotation from Paul when addressing the elders of Ephesus. It was later used of the elders at Philippi (Phil. 1:1), in the pastoral epistles (1 Tim. 3:1, 2; Titus 1:7), and by Peter of Christ as bishop of souls (1 Pet. 2:25). Only as the churches became more exclusively Gentile in membership and consequently more familiar with strictly Greek usage is "bishop" used to designate elders. The magistrates of the early Greek Colonies were called ἐπίσκοποι (*episkopoi*). It was as natural for the Grecian Christians to call their leaders ἐπίσκοποι (*episkopoi*) as for English-speaking Christians to call them overseers when it is desirable to denote them in relation to their function of directing.

That elders and bishops are not distinct classes of officers, but that the terms are used interchangeably, is evident from a review of their use in the New Testament. In Acts 20:17 we read that Paul "sent to Ephesus, and called the *elders* of the church." In verse 28 he tells them the Holy Ghost had made them *bishops* [ἐπίσκοποι (*episkopoi*)]. Here Paul identifies bishops with elders. The supposition is not admissible that a particular person is referred to as the bishop over the other elders, for Paul is addressing them all. Also the plural form of the

term is used, which excludes the prelatical idea of one bishop over the elders of a local church or diocese. Paul addresses, "All the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons" (Phil. 1:1). The plural number here is exclusive of the idea that in this church one bishop ruled over a plurality of elders. Also the fact that there were a plurality of bishops in this one local church and no mention is made of elders while deacons are mentioned is strong reason for believing that to the apostles the terms are interchangeable. He does use them interchangeably in Titus 1:5-7. "Ordain *elders* in every city. . . . If any be blameless. . . . For a *bishop* must be blameless." In 1 Pet. 5:1, 2 the elders are exhorted "taking the oversight," or acting as bishops.

That the elders and bishops of the apostolic churches were identical is not only found to be a truth of Scripture by opposers of prelacy, but is also admitted by its supporters, and especially by the early church fathers. Among those of the latter class may be mentioned Jerome and Augustine. Conybeare and Howson, themselves prelatists, say, "These terms are used in the New Testament as equivalents; the former (ἐπίσκοπος) [*episkopos*] denoting (as its meaning, *overseer*, implies) the duties; the latter (πρεσβύτερος) [*presbuteros*] the rank of the office" (Vol. 1, p. 434). Dean Alford also admits, "The title ἐπίσκοπος (*episkopos*), as applied to one person superior to the πρεσβύτεροι (*presbyterei*), and answering to our bishops, appears to have been unknown in apostolic times." With the foregoing evidence that elders and bishops were identical in the apostolic church, there is no room in the government of the New Testament church for prelacy or any kind of rule which requires grades in the ministry by which some exercise authority over others.

One other important designation of ministers in the New Testament church—pastors—remains to be considered. The term "pastor," from ποίμην (*poimen*), signifies one who feeds a flock. The function is practically identical with that of teaching, and in the list of classes of ministerial functions in Eph. 4:11 pastors and teachers are regarded as identical. The pastor is identical with the elder or bishop. The elders of Ephesus, who are also said to be bishops, are exhorted to "feed [ποιμαίνειν (*poimainein*)] the church of God" (Acts 20:28). The term pastor, like bishop, is synonymous with elder, and like bishop

differs from elder in that it denotes a function of the office while elder denotes its rank. After discussing these and other less important designations of the minister, W. H. H. Marsh says, "Of the eight terms defined, elder seems to be the only one specifically denoting the ministry of the word apart from function and relation. All the others seem to refer much more closely to functions and relations than to the title of the office to which they belong" (The New Testament Church, p. 477).

The duties of the pastor are as follows: (1) To preach and teach the Word of God. Paul exhorted the elders of Ephesus to follow his example in this respect. "Apt to teach" is one of the qualifications for the office as described by Paul. (2) To administer the ordinances. In the Great Commission the command to those who preach the gospel is also to baptize. Paul baptized some of the members of the Corinthian church. Philip baptized the Ethiopian. There is no evidence in the Scriptures that any but ministers ever baptized. (3) The government and spiritual oversight of the church. The term elder denotes a spiritual ruler. A bishop is one who has the oversight of others. A pastor is a shepherd and is responsible to guide, feed, and protect the flock. The writer to the Hebrews charges them, "Obey them that have the rule over you" (Heb. 13:17). He presides in the assembly of the local church.

3. **Deacons.**—The questions which here present themselves for consideration are relative to the nature of the office and the work of the deacon. That deacons constitute a distinct class of church officers is clear in the New Testament (Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:1-13). But is the deacon's work of a spiritual nature or does it consist in caring merely for the temporal and material interests of the church? What is his relation to the elder and to the congregation? We can best understand the nature of the work of the deacon if we first understand what is the meaning of the term "deacon." This word occurs only five times in the English New Testament (Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:8, 10, 12, 13). It is not a translation of the Greek word διάκονος (*diakonos*), but is this Greek word anglicized and transferred. In the Greek Testament, where the word occurs seventy-one times either in its noun or verbal form, it always carries with it the idea of service, help, subordination. In classical usage the Greek word in its verbal form means, according to Liddel and Scott, "to

wait on, serve, do service.'' The Greek word is often used for servant either bond or hired. A deacon, then, is a helper, and the word carries with it the idea of service, help, and subordination.

The deacons' work is to assist or help the pastors of the congregations. The apostolic church was a very simple organization. It had its preachers who had the oversight of the congregations, and who were variously designated according to the functions of their office as pastors, bishops, or elders. The different persons who assisted them in any phase of their duties were deacons or helpers. These were not a specially appointed ''board,'' but were those who had the ability and disposition to assist the elders. Διάκονος (*diakonos*) was the word in the Greek commonly used to designate those who thus served or assisted; therefore these servants of the churches and helpers of the pastors were called deacons. Doubtless at first the word was not used in a technical sense, or to designate those in an office. The functions of the office of deacon are well expressed by the word ''helps'' in the list of spiritual gifts in 1 Cor. 12:28. Some persons are not pastors in the full sense, yet they have divinely given qualifications that make them excellent helpers for the pastors. These are deacons. They are often called ''assistant pastors'' or ''spiritual workers.''

On the ground of the meaning of the term used to designate the office, it is proper to regard the work of deacons as being as great in variety as is that of the pastor. In whatever sphere the elder needs help these may help. If there is need of their services in the financial interests of the church, in caring for the poor, or in other temporal interests of the church, these are properly aspects of their work. But they may also properly assist the pastor in preaching, teaching, praying for those in need of physical or spiritual help from God, or in other functions pertaining to the ministry.

The work of deacons has not uncommonly been assumed to be the administration of the financial and material affairs of the church. The seven men appointed by the Jerusalem church are cited as evidence that such is the specific duty of deacons. But that these men were deacons is only an assumption entirely without Scriptural support. *They are nowhere called deacons* in the Bible. Luke mentions them in Acts 21:8, twenty-five years

after their selection, which was certainly long after deacons had become common in the apostolic churches, but he does not refer to them as the seven deacons, as he naturally would have done had they been regarded as such. He simply calls them "the seven." They were merely a business committee appointed for a temporary need. Some of these may have been merely dependable, devout lay members such as a local church might elect on a board of trustees. Some of them, apart from their election on this committee, may have possessed gifts and have done such service as constituted them deacons in the usual sense, but it is certain that at least two of these seven men, Stephen and Philip, were among the greatest preachers of the apostolic period, ranking with Paul and Barnabas. One early church writer states that they were all of the Seventy; therefore were elders. These seven can be regarded as deacons only in the broad sense of the term that they served the church and assisted the apostles by relieving them of certain work of a business nature. This furnishes no ground for confounding their service with the distinct class of church officers of whom Paul writes. Neither is such ground furnished by the word διακονία (*diakonia*), rendered service (Acts 6:1), which might be used of the service rendered by any one. The work these seven men were appointed to perform can not properly be regarded as an example of the specific duties of the New Testament deacon.

The list of qualifications for the office of deacon given in 1 Tim. 3:8-13 does not furnish any light as to what are the functions of the office. The qualities there given have to do wholly with the character and fitness of the man who fills the office, and are such as should be possessed by any man whom the church trusts to do any important service. The qualifications of deacons as described in that chapter are almost identical with those of the elder. If they proved anything as to the nature of the work of the deacon, it would be that his work is similar to that of the elder.

II. Nature of the Government of the Church

1. **A Divine and a Human Aspect.**—The functions of government are legislative, judicial, and executive. An absolute ruler combines all of these in his administration of his government. The government of the New Testament church is an absolute monarchy as far as the source of authority is concerned. Christ

is supreme ruler of it. Of him it was predicted, "The government shall be upon his shoulder" (Isa. 9:6). He is "the head over all things to the church" (Eph. 1:22). All governmental power is from him. Any ruling authority in the church that does not proceed from him is an usurped authority. The laws by which it is governed are divinely given. The Holy Spirit is the one who adds members to the church and he is the one who cuts them off when they sin. He it is who calls, qualifies, and sends forth his ministers. "The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. . . . So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed" (Acts 13:2-4). Though he employed human instruments as a medium through which to send them forth, yet they were "sent forth by the Holy Ghost." Christ did not cease to govern his church when he died on the cross, but still lives and rules his church today through the operation of the Holy Spirit. The divine element is basic in the government of the church, and no view of church government which disregards it can be correct. All else must be conformed to this fundamental idea.

But as was shown concerning the organization of the church, there is not only a divine but also a human aspect in the government of the church. This is clearly recognized by the apostle Paul. Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in word and doctrine" (1 Tim. 5:17). "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God" (Heb. 13:7). "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you" (v. 17). The same is implied in those texts which represent the elders as having the oversight or being directors of congregations (Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 5:2). The nature of this rule or oversight is implied in a measure in the foregoing texts. They did not make laws for the church, but spoke to them "the word of God." They were not lords over God's people, but were divinely appointed to care for and guide them, and were responsible to God for the salvation of the souls of those under them. Whatever authority they had was only such as had been delegated to them by Christ.

Church government includes, then, both a divine and a hu-

man aspect. It is effected by a cooperation of the divine and the human. An illustration of the relation of the divine and human operation in church government is to be found in the giving of the Scriptures. The human writers used their minds and, though seeking to do God's will, they functioned unhampered. Likewise the Spirit of God accomplishes his will in ruling his church through human instrumentality. The Spirit not only uses the elders especially, in ruling the church, but also operates through the various members of the congregation for the same purpose. The sending out of Barnabas and Saul was by the elders at Antioch at the direction of the Spirit. But when a certain member of the church at Corinth had sinned the whole congregation were made responsible for the exercise of discipline. Government by the whole congregation is also implied in the words, "If he neglect to hear the church" (Matt. 18:17). Also in discoursing concerning spiritual gifts Paul allows that "all may prophesy" or receive "a revelation" for the congregation even if he is not an elder. These are important elements in true church government. Therefore in its human aspect the government of the church is both presbyterian and congregational.

Because of the natural fallibility of the human instruments employed in church government, errors may be made. Instead of the Word of God, commandments of men may be preached. The church may for a time reject those whom God has accepted, as in the case of the newly converted Saul and the church at Jerusalem. No system or lack of system can entirely eliminate such errors. But to the extent members of the church keep filled with the Spirit, man-rule will be excluded.

2. **Nature of Ministerial Authority.**—Because Christ is the sole source of authority in the church, therefore whatever authority elders may have is from him. But the authority they have is not of that sort on which human government rests, and which inheres merely in the position to which one has been appointed. Neither is the authority of that driving, compelling kind that is common to human government. The authority which Christ delegates to ministers is of the same nature as that which he exercises directly in his dealings with men. He does not compel men to serve him, but influences them to do so by manifestations of goodness and love. Ministerial authority has its

basis in the power of elders to influence God's people. This power is determined by the gifts which God has bestowed upon the elders. Though all ministers are of equal grade officially, yet because some have greater gifts than others their influence is wider and they consequently have greater ruling authority. One's gifts may be such that he will wield a proper authority or rule, not merely over one congregation, but over all the churches in a large region. This was true of the apostle Paul especially. Such a view of ministerial authority does not exclude the power of discipline. When the Word of God has been faithfully preached and one professing to be a member of the church wilfully disobeys it, it is the duty of the minister and the entire congregation, if he disregards all proper efforts to save him from his error, to count him "as an heathen man and a publican." But no penalty can properly be inflicted by them upon him.

There is another aspect of ministerial authority which does not result directly from one's divine gifts and call, but rather from the call or recognition of the local church which the minister serves. It is evident that an elder of a particular local congregation has certain ruling power in that particular congregation which another elder from a congregation near by who might be visiting the first-mentioned congregation does not possess, even though both are equally endowed with spiritual gifts. The elder of the first congregation has authority to call or preside at its meetings, to decide who shall and who shall not preach from its pulpit, and to direct the work of the congregation. It is an aspect of ministerial authority which proceeds directly from the local church by their recognition of him as their elder, whether that recognition is given him by a formal ordination or informally by general assent. Doubtless normally such recognition of an elder by a local church should be and is on the ground of spiritual gifts he possesses. That the government of the church is more properly described as divine government than charismatic government is certain from the fact that much of it is effected directly by Christ in relation to the individual members as well as through the giving of special gifts to elders or others. The government of the church is divine and is charismatic to the extent that it is effected *through* gifts given to men.

3. **Number and Choice of Local Church Officers.**—Though all

the members of the church possess spiritual gifts, yet some possess gifts of such a nature as to constitute them officers of the church. These officers, including elders and deacons, are recognized in the Scriptures as distinct from the members in general (Acts 20:17; Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:1-13). They were divinely constituted as officers, but their relation to a particular congregation was dependent upon two things—(1) their association with it and (2) its recognition of them in their official capacity as over it, much as one who is truly saved and a member of the universal church becomes a member of a particular local congregation only by his associating himself with it and its recognition of him as a member. One's being an officer in a local church, then, requires not only his being divinely qualified and called to it, but also the recognition and acceptance of him as such on the part of the local congregation. That acceptance by the congregation may be by the act of ordination, a formal vote, or informal assent. In any case such action is essential to the proper functioning of an officer in relation to a local church.

But how many elders or deacons should a local church be expected to have at one time? From the very nature of the method by which they are developed no fixed number should be expected in every case. The number varies according to the size of the congregation and the needs. It is certain the local churches of the apostolic period frequently had several elders. In the Jerusalem church "the *elders*" are mentioned (Acts 15:6). The church at Ephesus had "*elders*" (Acts 20:17). In the church at Philippi were "*bishops* and *deacons*" (Phil. 1:1). Titus was left in Crete to "ordain *elders* in every city" (Titus 1:5). The sick are instructed to "call for the *elders* of the church" (Jas. 5:14). In these texts is proof of a plurality of elders in each of those local churches. Especially the last text is ground for the inference that a plurality of elders in the local church was common. No clear proof is afforded by Scripture of a church with but one elder. In the Revelation the messages to the seven churches are addressed to "the angel of the church," but it is not certain that this refers to the pastor. Probably it does.

History furnishes equally certain proof that the early local churches had a plurality of elders. Polycarp urges the Philippian church to "subject themselves to their presbyters and dea-

cons.'' Tertullian says of the local church, ''Certain approved elders preside.'' In speaking of the apostolic churches Neander says, ''The guidance of the communities was entrusted to a Council of elders'' (History of the Christian Church, Vol. 1, p. 184).

Doubtless the normal New Testament church today will have a plurality of elders. An important question arises in the present connection as to whether there should be one among them recognized as the ''pastor.'' The ''angels'' of the churches were probably such. Early church writers state that in the second century the presbyters of the local church appointed one of their own number to preside over them and the congregation, but that he was only first among equals. Yet it is doubtful whether any clear evidence exists that the early churches had but one ''pastor'' in the modern sense. Probably conditions were such that they did not have the same occasion for a single special pastor as seems to be demanded by modern conditions. For economic reasons usually a church today can have but one elder to give his entire time to its service. It has been found an advantage, when it is possible, to have one supported financially by the congregation to devote himself to its care. Even if the support of more than one is possible it has been found an advantage usually for one to be entrusted and charged especially with the responsibility of presiding over and directing the work of the congregation. This makes for efficiency and insures in a measure against neglect of important work. The Scripture statements are not opposed to such a practise. The elder thus recognized as the special overseer is usually one especially fitted for his work by training, experience, and spiritual gifts. The recognition of such a special pastor, though possibly without precedent in the Scriptures, is not opposed by any Scripture teaching and is a good practise if he is not given such a place in relation to other elders in the congregation as to hinder their functioning in the way God would have them. This recognition as the special pastor of one of the divinely appointed elders of a local church is not in disregard of the divine government of the church, but in conformity with it. It is simply allowing him opportunity in a larger measure to do the very work which he has been divinely called and qualified to do.

The choosing of elders in the local church is represented in

the New Testament as being, in a measure at least, the work of other ministers. Paul and Barnabas ordained elders in the new churches they established (Acts 14:23). Titus was directed to ordain elders in every city. There is no reason for believing this was done independently of the approval or cooperation of the members of those congregations. In the nature of the case the concurrence of the church is necessary in the appointing or ordaining of elders in local churches. The exact method to be followed in this may vary in different instances and is not pertinent to this discussion.

Certain questions relative to the choosing of deacons remain for consideration. The nature of the office and work of deacons has been discussed. We now inquire: (1) Are they constituted deacons by God or by election by the church? (2) Are they to be ordained?

With the lack of evidence that "the seven" elected at Jerusalem were deacons we have no Scripture example of the election of deacons. Because of the nature of their work, deacons can not be made such by election or other human process for the same reason that elders can not be so constituted. As elders are such because God has called them and given them spiritual gifts for their work, so deacons, or assistant pastors, are such because they are divinely qualified to be such by those gifts that Paul describes as "helps." The idea of a board of deacons consisting of a definite number whether or not that number be seven is without New Testament support. As a man can not be constituted a preacher by election, so one can not be made a deacon by votes. But as a congregation may choose one from those who have already been constituted preachers by God to take the particular responsibility of caring for it, so those who are already constituted deacons by God because of his having given them spiritual gifts may be selected either by the pastor or by the congregation to perform some particular phase of work in which the pastor needs assistance. One such spiritual worker may be appointed to the work of visiting the sick, another to visiting the members of the church having spiritual difficulties, another to visiting the poor, another to leading prayer-meetings, or another to assisting in the Lord's Supper. For the purpose of fixing responsibility for certain work a board may be elected from those who are already deacons. But such

a board may not properly assume to rule the congregation and dictate to the pastor.

The Bible makes no mention of the ordination of deacons, inasmuch as the "seven" can not be said to have been deacons. It does not teach, however, that they may not be ordained. But certainly it is not improper when deacons are appointed to some special service in the church as before mentioned, the same as when lay members or preachers are so appointed, that such appointment should be accompanied by the laying on of hands and prayer. It is even desirable that such recognition should be accorded them.

Chapter III

APOSTASY AND RESTORATION OF THE CHURCH

In view of what has been said of the constitution of the apostolic church, it must be obvious even to the casual observer that the nature of the organization and government of the modern church is very unlike that described in the New Testament. A radical departure from the faith and practises of the primitive church has taken place. The church has apostatized from the teachings of the Scriptures and that divine organization and government of it therein represented. This falling away is the ground for the need of a restoration or reformation of the church. The nature of this reformation is determined by the nature of the apostasy. Therefore, in order to understand what should be accomplished in the work of reformation we must first inquire concerning what was the nature of that apostasy.

Such inquiry is properly within the province of systematic theology. No ecclesiology is complete today which omits a discussion of the principles of the constitution of the New Testament church in relation to the teaching and polity of the modern humanly organized churches. The insistent demand of recent years on the part of the Christian world for unity makes such a consideration incumbent upon the theologian of the present time.

I. The Apostasy of the Church

1. **Two Aspects of Apostasy Predicted.**—To allay the anxiety of the Thessalonian Christians concerning the near approach of the second advent of Christ, the apostle Paul wrote them, "That day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. . . . And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth [restraineth, A. S. V.] will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him whose coming is after the working

of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders'' (2 Thess. 2:3-9).

These words are a clear prediction that an apostasy should come. The original of our word ''apostasy'' is found in the Greek ἀποστασία (*apostasia*), which is rendered ''falling away'' in verse 3. That a correct exegesis of these verses describes a great apostasy then future and that this exegesis is common among interpreters is shown by the following quotation from the Pulpit Commentary: ''The prediction of St. Paul concerning the Man of Sin made a deep impression upon the early Fathers, and the references to it in their writings are numerous. There is also a comparative unanimity in their sentiments. In general, they considered that the fulfilment of the prediction was future; that the Man of Sin was Antichrist, and an individual; and that the restraining influence was the Roman Empire. . . .

''The Reformers in general adopted this opinion. Such were the views of Luther, Calvin, Zwinglius, Melanchthon, Beza, and Bucer; and, among English Reformers, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, and Jewell. According to them, the apostasy is the falling away from the evangelical doctrine to the traditions of men and the corruptions of popery; the Man of Sin, or Antichrist, is not, as the Fathers conceived, an individual, but the succession of popes; and the restraining power is the Roman Empire, out of whose ruins the papacy arose. The Lutheran Church inserted this opinion as an article in their creed (Article Smalc., ii, 4). In the dedication of the translators of the authorized version of King James, it is assumed that the pope is the Man of Sin; and that monarch is complimented for writing in the defense of the truth, which gave 'such a blow unto that Man of Sin as will not be healed.' And the assertion that the pope is Antichrist and the Man of Sin, forms one of the articles of the Westminster Confession: 'There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof, but is that Antichrist, that Man of Sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God' (ch. XXV. 6). . . . Besides the early Reformers, this opinion is advocated by Hooker, Hurd, Newton, Turretin, Benson, Bengel, Doddridge, Macknight, Michaelis, Elliott, and Bishop Wordsworth. . . . In the view of those who regard the pope as the Man of Sin, this prediction was fully verified.

No sooner was the restrainer removed than the Man of Sin was revealed. As long as the Roman Emperor continued heathen and resident at Rome, no ecclesiastical power was permitted to exalt itself. . . .

"Are the characteristics of the Man of Sin found in popery? Those who belong to this class of interpreters assert that the resemblance is striking and obvious. An apostasy is predicted, and there is in Romanism a falling away from the pure gospel to the traditions of men; the doctrines of purgatory, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the Mass, the adoration of the Virgin and the Saints, are adduced as examples. The Man of Sin is represented as opposing and exalting himself against all that is called God or is an object of worship; and this is considered as receiving its fulfilment in the pope exalting himself above all human and divine authority, claiming the title 'king of kings and lord of lords,' applying to himself the words of the psalmist, 'All kings shall bow down before thee,' styling himself universal bishop, and asserting his power to dispose of the kingdoms of the earth. The Man of Sin is said to seat himself in the temple of God, showing himself as God. The temple of God is here understood to be the Christian Church, and the pope places himself in it as its supreme head, the vicar of Jesus Christ. He shows himself as God by claiming divine attributes, as holiness and infallibility; assuming divine prerogatives, as the power of pardoning sins and the opening and shutting of the kingdom of heaven; and using such divine titles as 'Our Lord God the Pope,' 'Another God on earth.' Every pope on his election is placed on the high altar at St. Peter's, and receives the adoration of the cardinals. The coming of the Man of Sin is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and wonders of falsehood. And this is considered as receiving its fulfilment in the false miracles of popery; in the imposition of indulgences and purgatory; in the wonders done by sacred images moving, speaking, bleeding; in the prodigies effected by sacred relics; in the supernatural visitations of the Virgin, and in the pretended power of working miracles which the church of Rome still claims. . . . And, besides, in the other passage where Paul predicts the falling away of the latter times, the marks which he gives find their counterpart in the corruption of popery: 'Giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speak-

ing lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats' (1 Tim. iv. 1-3). Paul represents the system as working even in his days: 'For the mystery of lawlessness is already working' (ch. ii. 7).

"So that," as Bishop Newton observes, the foundations of popery were laid, indeed, in the apostles' days, but the superstructure was raised by degrees, and several ages passed before the building was completed, and the Man of Sin was revealed in full perfection.

"Of course, according to this view of the subject, the complete fulfilment of the prophecy is still future. The destruction of the Man of Sin—that is, Romanism—is also predicted: 'Whom the Lord Jesus will slay with the breath of his mouth, and annihilate by the appearance of his coming' (ch. ii. 8). . . . Upon the whole, on an impartial review of the subject, we can not avoid the impression that the points of resemblance between the prophecy and Romanism are numerous, varied, and striking. Our forefathers had no doubt as to the application of the prediction, and perhaps they were nearer the truth than we in modern times, who hesitate. Such an opinion may be considered as uncharitable and unjust, and is certainly not in accordance with the more liberal spirit of our age, where popery is viewed as it presently exists, divested of its power to persecute, and as seen in the culture, refinement, and piety of many of its adherents. But when we reflect upon the abominable persecutions of the Inquisition, the monstrous wickedness of the popes prior to the Reformation, the atrocities perpetrated in the name of religion, the crimes committed by the priests, and the general corruption of the whole system; and when we think that it is only the restraining influence of Protestantism which prevents a repetition of such actions, we may see reason, if not to affirm positively, yet to suspect that such an opinion may be founded on truth, and if so, be neither uncharitable nor unjust."

Two aspects of apostasy are described in the prophecy under consideration. (1) A falling away, or departure, from the faith, or teaching, of the New Testament was to take place. The faith and practises of Christians were to undergo a change because of a rejection of the Word of God and a substitution therefor of the traditions and commandments of men. (2) The revelation

and exaltation of the "man of sin" was to result in his usurpation of the place and authority of God in the "temple," or church, of God. This aspect of apostasy doubtless refers to the rejection of the rule of the Holy Spirit in the church in favor of a system of man rule.

Besides this more particular prediction of the apostasy, one phase or the other of it is represented in other texts. "Many false prophets shall arise, and shall deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold" (Matt. 24:11, 12). "Some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils" (1 Tim. 4:1). "There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies" (2 Pet. 2:1).

2. **A Rejection of the Teaching of the Word of God.**—The substitution of human traditions for the true faith was rapid, though gradual. Christianity had largely departed from the faith by the end of the third century. To set forth in order the various false doctrines and superstitious practises is the function of church history rather than of systematic theology. Our present purpose requires only the citation of such examples as will give an adequate idea of the nature of the aspect of apostasy under discussion.

As early as the third century simple faith in Christ for salvation began to be obscured by many unscriptural rites and ceremonies. Baptismal regeneration gained wide acceptance, and baptism itself not only became changed as to mode and meaning, but was burdened with the addition of a very elaborate ritual. Concerning the observance of baptism in the third century, Rutter says, "Nor was the sacrament of baptism administered to any till the humble catechumen had been publicly exorcised, had acknowledged himself under the influence of a malignant spirit, and had submitted to a long preparation. . . . The catechumen was exorcised for twenty days previous to his baptism, in order to deliver him from the supposed dominion of evil spirits, and during that time was prepared by abstinence, the knowledge of the Lord's prayer, and the Articles of Belief, for becoming a member of the church. In imitation of the pagans, the Christians had thought proper to introduce mysteries into the religion of Christ; and the administration of baptism, confirmation, ordination, the celebration of the Lord's Supper,

the Lord's prayer, and a number of other offices were industriously concealed from the catechumen. . . . Confirmation immediately followed the reception of baptism. This ceremony consisted in anointing them with holy oil and the imposition of hands; the former of which practises was probably introduced about the beginning of this century; and to this unction was ascribed the effect of confirming the soul in all spiritual graces on the part of God, and the confirmation of the profession of a Christian on the part of the man. White garments were distributed to the neophytes upon their being baptized, which after being worn eight days were deposited in the church. The believer, who by this rite became incorporated into the society of Christians, was congratulated upon his admission with the kiss of peace, and was presented with a mixture of milk and honey, or milk and wine. After a few other trifling ceremonies, he was permitted to partake of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which began in several of the more opulent societies to be administered with much external pomp'' (Church History, pp. 53-55).

The true significance of the Lord's Supper was also obscured by the doctrines of the sacrifice of the mass, and of transubstantiation. The clergy came to be regarded as a priesthood. Salvation was made to depend upon works of penance and observance of fasts, Easter, and Lent. The doctrine of salvation through the sufferings of purgatory was substituted for the teaching of salvation through faith in Christ alone. Much was said of making the sign of the cross on the forehead on various occasions. Celibacy was enjoined on the priesthood, and special rewards in heaven were offered to others who refrained from marriage, which resulted in monasticism with its attendant corruptions. Image worship, the adoration of Mary, and supplication of the saints were among other God-dishonoring practises. That these teachings and practises constitute a departure from the primitive faith of the church every informed person will admit.

3. **A Rejection of the Rule of the Spirit of God.**—Coincident with the departure from the faith was the rise of the man of sin. Indeed that impious system of man rule could have had no place except for a falling away from the teaching of the New Testament. The rule of the Holy Spirit in the church was lost

sight of and instead a system was originated after the order of the civil government whereby men should usurp the place that rightfully belonged to God. This system of man rule over the church is the second of the two phases of the apostasy. Both in the prediction of the "man of sin" in the second Thessalonian epistle and also in the symbolic prophecies of Revelation and Daniel it is represented as especially blaspheming God by usurping prerogatives which are rightly his. Any system or power that excludes God from ruling over his own church is especially displeasing to him, and might well be termed a man of sin. The superstitions and abuses of the papacy are objectionable, but the Scriptures represent as especially so that human ecclesiasticism which usurps the divine prerogative of ruling the church of God, whether that ecclesiasticism be the papal system or another humanly constituted power.

The first steps in the growth of human ecclesiasticism probably appeared to those of that time as harmless innovations, and doubtless were not prompted by altogether evil motives. As men came to think of Christ as being absent from his church they assumed the necessity of a humanly constituted government. When they lost sight of the important truth that the authority of the minister has its basis in his divine gifts, they began to recognize positional authority by making the authority to inhere in the position rather than in the man who filled it. The internal bond which unites Christians was disregarded in favor of an external union through human organization with all lines of authority leading to a single human head.

Such an organization was not effected suddenly, but by very gradual stages. It was begun in the second century by the distinction of two classes in the ministry, presbyters and bishops, and the exaltation of the bishops over the elders. Concerning the rise of the organization George P. Fisher in his church history says, "The first three centuries witnessed the gradual growth of a hierarchical organization. . . . Country churches, formed under the auspices of a neighboring city church, were affiliated with it, and had for their pastor a presbyter of the parent church, subject to its bishop. Rural churches planted independently had each of them its own bishop. The country bishops, for a considerable time, kept up their independence; but most of these churches, before the beginning of the fourth

century, were subordinated, like the class of rural churches first mentioned, to the neighboring city community. Thus each city bishop had a jurisdiction covering the town and the vicinity. . . .

"The bishop of the metropolis of each Roman province naturally acquired a precedence over other bishops within its limits. This was owing to the rank of the city, for, generally speaking, it was this consideration, more than any other, that determined the relative dignity of bishops. Another consideration was the fact that, not infrequently, from the provincial capital the gospel was planted in many other places. The metropolitan arrangement was slow in being introduced in the West, because in that region the cities were comparatively few. The prerogatives of metropolitans were for a long time undefined. The theory of the equality and independence of bishops continued to be held, and on occasions was boldly asserted.

"The hierarchical tendency led to the elevation to a still higher position of the bishops of a few principal cities, which were, moreover, regarded as having been seats of the apostles in a peculiar sense. The designation "archbishop," first applied to all metropolitans, came at length to be a title of these metropolitans of the first rank. They were also, eventually, styled primates or patriarchs. They were, in this period, the bishops of Antioch, Alexandria, and, especially, Rome. . . . The dignity of the metropolitans was enhanced through synods, in which they were the presiding officers. . . .

"The conception of the visible church as one body, together with the exaggerated notion of Peter's precedence among the apostles, created a silent demand for a continuance of this primacy. Where should this be found—where could the central point of episcopal authority be discovered—save at the capital of the world, in the church which, as men were coming to believe, Peter had founded and of which he had been the first pastor? . . . The association of Peter and Paul with Rome made the church there an apostolic see of the loftiest rank. The exalted political importance of Rome, and its transcendent fame among cities, lent an unequalled dignity to its bishop" (History of the Christian Church, pp. 56, 57).

Though the primacy of the bishop of Rome was not undisputed until a later date, yet the foregoing quotation shows that the system of which it was the logical culmination was developed

before the end of the third century. These different gradations of the clergy—presbyters, bishops, metropolitans, patriarchs, and pope—constituted purely human organization and were for no other purpose than human government of the church. The authority of such officers was conferred by a superior, was determined by the position, and was not a result of endowment with spiritual gifts by the Holy Ghost. Such man rule in the church excluded the rule of the Spirit of God.

The apostasy, then, consisted in a rejection of God's two witnesses (Rev. 11:3), the Word and the Spirit of God, as the rulers of God's people.

II. Sixteenth Century Reformation Partial

1. **A Partial Return to the Bible.**—All Protestants look back to the sixteenth century as the time of reformation. Doubtless a great religious reformation took place at that time. Like other great social convulsions, it had been long in preparation. It was but one aspect of a broader movement in breaking away from medievalism. As a result of the invention of printing and the general revival of learning, the Scriptures began to be more widely circulated. Men of letters in western Europe began to read the Scriptures in the original Hebrew and Greek. A great aid to the work of reformation was the translation of the Bible into the vernacular of the countries of western Europe. But the real cause of the reformation was the working of the Spirit of God in connection with the study and preaching of the Word of God.

As one aspect of the apostasy consisted in a departure from the teaching of the Scriptures, so a return to the Scriptures resulted in a rejection of unscriptural doctrines and practises. The great Biblical truth of salvation by faith alone was given special prominence. This necessarily excluded the idea of salvation through purgatory, penance, the mediation of the saints, and other means of salvation by works that had been introduced. Some of the reformers understood and preached more Bible truth than did others. Zwingli had a clearer conception of the nature of the Lord's Supper than did Luther. Some had clearer views of the mode and significance of baptism than did many others who accepted the teaching of the reformation. For lack of light the reformers continued to hold certain of the unscrip-

tural doctrines of Romanism. The Reformation, though a great movement of the Spirit of God and far-reaching in its influence, was but a partial return to the teaching of the Scriptures. Many truths such as holiness of life, entire sanctification, divine healing, or unity of Christians which were lost sight of in the early centuries were not recovered by the reformers, and though held by some in a greater or less measure during the post-Reformation period, yet are still unfamiliar to a large proportion of Christians.

2. **Human Ecclesiasticism Continued.**—While the departure from evangelical truth was partially overcome by the Reformation of the sixteenth century, yet that other aspect of the apostasy—man rule instead of the rule of the Spirit of God—was perpetuated. It is true the papacy was rejected by the reformers along with the blasphemous claims of the pope's being the infallible vicar of Christ on earth. The spiritual domination of Rome over men's consciences was broken. But the reformers did not return to the primitive ideal of church organization and government. For hundreds of years men had thought of the church as an externally and humanly organized body. The reformers had no other conception of the church than that which was commonly accepted in their day. They did not originally intend separation from Rome, and only separated when the pope rejected them because of the gospel truth which they taught.

The world church idea gave place to the conception of national churches. The rulers of the various nations of Europe held supreme power except in the affairs of the church in which the pope was the highest authority. The national church demanded a national headship. The kings of the various Protestant countries, who had often been jealous of the ecclesiastical authority of the pope, were glad enough to assume the oversight of these national churches. In a considerable measure they came to exercise authority in the affairs of the church in their respective realms similar to that which had formerly belonged to the pope. And doubtless for lack of better understanding and in conformity with the ecclesiastical ideals of their times, the reformers approved the organization of these national churches headed by their civil rulers.

But these national churches were of the same essential nature

as the Romish church as far as the principle of man rule was concerned. This is true even though they introduced various modifications of forms and usages. They were imitations of the Church of Rome. When the beast religion of Rome was rejected, an image of the beast was set up to claim men's allegiance. See Rev. 13:14. The clergy of these national churches was self-perpetuating as was that of the Romish church and, as a body, possessed legislative, judicial, and administrative authority. In other words, they claimed "the power of the keys," which made their government the same in its essential nature with that of the Roman hierarchy.

3. **Protestant Divisions.**—This erroneous conception brought over from Romanism of the nature of the church determined the nature of the early Protestant churches. It was also that which made a place for the organization of sects and the formation of creeds. With the idea that the church was an external union of men by human organization and that the enactment of its laws and the administration of its government were purely human, founders of sects consistently assumed that they might properly formulate creeds and organize churches. The real cause of Protestant sects is to be found in this wrong conception of what is the church. It is often assumed that the divisions of which Protestantism has been so fruitful are the result of insurmountable limitations of human understanding on the one hand and of religious liberty on the other. But the apostolic church was one and it knew nothing of many humanly organized sects; yet the average Christian of that period was as limited in understanding as are men of today, and religious liberty among Christians existed prior to the apostasy as truly as it now exists. Historical facts show that it has not been religious liberty that has caused sects, but the lack of it. Those whose consciences led them to reject an existing creed, in seeking liberty from it and for failure to recognize the divinely given creed have formulated other creeds.

Human creeds not only have their origin in a wrong conception of the church, but are wrong in themselves. They are productive of sects as sects are productive of them. A human creed is a confession of faith as held by some synod or council possessing authority, written out as a form of union by which persons and things are to be tested, approved, or disapproved. But such

creeds are altogether without divine authority. No evidence exists that God ever approved of any such attempt by man to produce a rule of faith to govern God's people. In fact, those who formulate such creeds assume prerogatives which properly belong to God and reflect on his wisdom in giving the Scriptures. If a miniature Bible, or a condensed statement of religious truth, were needed surely the Holy Spirit would have inspired such a one as Peter or Paul to write it. It would not have been left to uninspired men. The Scripture is the only statement ever given which is acceptable to all Christians as a rule of faith. Therefore, the creeds of men result in dividing rather than in uniting God's people. That creeds are not necessary to the union of Christians is evident from the fact that the early church was one without a human creed.

But it is said that creeds are plainer than the Bible. Surely God is able to state the truth more plainly than can men. Since God could have stated the truth more plainly than man, if he did not he is less benevolent than is man. But God is perfectly wise and good; therefore he has given exactly such a revelation of truth as man needs and no human statement of the truth can be clearer than it. Again it is said that creeds are necessary to discipline. But discipline was exercised in the apostolic church before human creeds existed (2 Corinthians 5). But the supporters of creeds further urge that the teaching of their creed is the same as the Bible. If this be true then why not hold to the Scriptures alone, as the creed must be superfluous? Because the Scriptures are complete, any creed containing more, or less, or differing from the Scriptures must be imperfect and objectionable. But if a creed be exactly like the Scriptures, it is not a human creed at all, but the Bible itself.

Not only are the human creeds of Protestantism objectionable, but its denominationalism is also objectionable. Party names are condemned by the apostle Paul. "While one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?" (1 Cor. 3:4). For Christians today to denominate themselves Lutherans, Wesleyans, Calvinists, or call themselves by any other name than that which the mouth of the Lord has named is equally dishonoring to God. As a married lady honors her husband by bearing his name rather than that of another, so the church honors Christ by bearing his name whose wife she is rather than

another name. The Scriptures designate the true church as "the church of God" (Acts 20:28; 1 Cor. 1:2; 1 Tim. 3:5); also the "churches of Christ" (Rom. 16:16).

Divisions among Christians are not only objectionable because they are the product of an erroneous conception of the church, because of their human creeds, or because of their unscriptural denominations, but the division itself is wrong. This is evident from the words of Jesus, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (John 17:20, 21). The will of Christ is here clearly expressed concerning Christian unity. The apostolic exhortations are in harmony with this prayer. "Now I beseech you, brethren, . . . that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (1 Cor. 1:10). "Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3). At its most spiritual period the early church were "of one heart and one soul." Because all Christians have the same spirit and have been divinely inducted into one body, unity is natural and division is unnatural to them.

Without doubt the many divisions among Christians are condemned, not only by the clear texts already quoted, but by the whole tenor of the New Testament. It is sometimes argued by those who defend sects that they are necessary to keep the church clean, by watching over each other; and also that they are valuable in that they accommodate all classes, so if one can not conscientiously accept the doctrine of one sect he can choose from the variety one whose teaching suits him. But those who thus reason show inconsistency by proceeding to persuade all to believe as they do, which is virtually striving to do away with that very means which they say is necessary to the purity of the church and advantageous in causing the largest number to accept Christianity. But no reasoning can furnish a defense for division in view of all the Scriptures teach against it.

The unity of Christians is desirable for different reasons. First, divisions cause much strife, ill will, and animosity among those who profess to be Christians, which is evidently dishonoring to Christ. Second, in contending for the peculiar tenets of the

different creeds they cause great waste of time that might better be spent in disseminating the knowledge of salvation to those who know it not. Third, divisions among Christians cause a waste of millions of dollars, in multiplying church-buildings in communities where but one would otherwise be sufficient and in employing and paying several ministers to preach in these places where all might well listen to one, while this money might be used to send missionaries to the unevangelized, to circulate Bibles, or to feed and clothe the poor. Fourth, sects among Christians cause men to disbelieve in Christianity, as Jesus said oneness would cause the world to believe.

Because the existing divisions among Christians are directly contrary to the Bible and a great obstacle to the progress of the kingdom of Christ, all Christians should reject them. Because they are the result of a wrong idea of the church which originated in the apostasy, they should be rejected along with that erroneous theory. In this aspect especially the reformation of the sixteenth century was incomplete. A complete restoration of Christianity to the primitive standard is needed.

III. A Complete Restoration

1. **Present Tendency to Unity.**—Until the last generation organized sects and humanly constructed creeds have been supposed by Christians to be perfectly proper and necessary. Division among Christians has been in good repute, and those who opposed it were regarded as dangerous to the welfare of Christianity. But in recent years a radical change in sentiment in this respect has been developing. The Christian world is now calling for unity among the Christians and deploring the existing divisions. Since the World War this demand for unity has become more insistent. In discussing "recent tendencies" of the church, Williston Walker, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University, says in his new "History of the Christian Church" (March, 1918), "An outstanding feature of the existing religious situation in the United States and Canada is the decline of denominational rivalries, and the increase of cooperation in religious work. Voluntary associations for corporate Christian endeavor have developed remarkably. Conspicuous have been the Young Men's Christian Association, founded by George Williams (1821-1905) in London in 1844, and since

spread throughout the world, and its sister society, the Young Women's Christian Association, organized in England in 1855, and both peculiarly successful in the United States. They have never been more useful than during the World War. . . .

"It is from missions that the strongest impulses to cooperation have come. A powerful force in this direction has been the Student Volunteer Missionary Movement, launched in 1886. The manifest impropriety of transferring denominational divisions to the mission-field has led to large association of similar groups of Christians into single bodies in China, India, and Japan. The essential unity of missionary endeavor was manifest at the World Missionary Conference, held in Edinburg in 1910, the influence of which has been potent. The evils of religious rivalries led, in the United States, to the establishment of the Home Missions Council in 1908, composed of representatives of societies engaged in similar work. This has been followed by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, the Council of Women for Home Missions, and the Federation of Women's Boards of Foreign Missions.

"These associations are voluntary. A federation of a more organic character was created, after considerable preliminary negotiation, by the formation in 1908 of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, composed of official delegates from its cooperating churches. Its functions are advisory, not legislative or judicial. Its objects are: 'To express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian Church. To bring the Christian bodies of America into united service for Christ and the world. To encourage devotional fellowship and mutual counsel concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the churches. To secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life.' The Federal Council now has the support of thirty denominations, including such important bodies as the Northern Baptists, Congregationalists, Disciples, Lutherans (under the General Synod), Methodists, North and South, Presbyterians, North and South, Protestant Episcopalians, and the (Dutch and German) Reformed.

"A movement even more ambitious in its plans was inaugurated by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal

Church in the United States in 1910, aiming at an ultimate world conference on faith and order, which may effect the reunion of Christendom. The object has received the support of a majority of American Protestant bodies to the extent of official representation in several preliminary conferences which have been held, and an American delegation has urged cooperation in Great Britain with success. The World War has delayed the progress in other countries that was hoped'' (pp. 588, 589).

The foregoing statement shows at least the prevalence of the disposition for cooperation and even for organic union among Christians. But evidently in view of what has been said of the divine constitution of the church, all efforts at bringing Christians together through union of humanly organized churches is unscriptural and, in itself, is not that unity for which Jesus prayed and to which the apostles exhorted. If the principle of human ecclesiasticism by which the sects originated is wrong, no further application of that principle in a superorganization for the union of those sects can make the principle or the resulting organization Scriptural. Yet these efforts at union of the sects indicate a present-day tendency, and devout Christians, though they may for a time mistakenly hope for unity through these erroneous methods, will when enlightened welcome the true Bible unity.

2. **A Complete Reformation Predicted.**—As Inspiration foretold the apostasy from the faith and the rise of the man of sin, so likewise has it clearly predicted a complete restoration of the church. The subject is of sufficient importance to be worthy of a place in Scripture and prophecy. In fact, the prophecy of the apostasy is in itself reason for expecting a prediction of recovery from that condition.

In Daniel and Revelation are given at least five distinct series of symbolic prophecy, each of which clearly points out an apostasy and a complete restoration. These are, first, the dragon and beast religion (Revelation 12, 13) and the final triumph of the church in the fall of Babylon (Revelation 14:1-9); second, the pure woman, her seclusion in the wilderness (Revelation 12), and the restoration represented by the 144,000 on Mount Zion (Revelation 14:1-6); third, the holy city trodden down and the slaying of the two witnesses (Revelation 11), God's Word

and Spirit, and the reformation in the resurrection of the witnesses (Rev. 11:11-14); fourth, mystery Babylon the great and her harlot daughters (Revelation 17) and the restoration of the church represented by the announcement that Babylon is fallen and God's people are called out of her (Rev. 18:1-4); fifth, the fourth beast and the reign of the little horn (Daniel 7) and the later triumph of the kingdom of Christ (Dan. 7:26, 27; 2:34, 35). Space forbids a full exegesis of these texts, but the reader is referred to an able treatment of the subject, "The Last Reformation," by F. G. Smith, published by the Gospel Trumpet Company, Anderson, Ind.

In addition to the symbolic prophecies referred to, a plain prediction of the restoration of the church is given in the Old Testament as follows: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the light shall not be clear, nor dark: but it shall be one day which shall be known to the Lord, not day, nor night: but it shall come to pass, that at evening time it shall be light" (Zech. 14:6, 7). Probably more impressive than anything we might say on this text is the following note from the Bible commentary of Thomas Scott, who wrote a century ago, before the present reformation movement began, which gives added value to his interpretation: " 'In that day,' under the Christian dispensation, for a long season, the light would neither be 'clear nor dark'; it would be greatly obscured by ignorance, heresy, superstition, and idolatry; yet not wholly extinguished; and the state of the church would be much deformed by sin and calamities; yet some holiness and consolation would be found. This period could neither be called a clear bright day, cheered and illuminated by the shining of a summer's sun; nor would it be dark, as if the sun were set, or totally eclipsed: but it would contain a great mixture of truth and error, of holiness and sin, of happiness and misery. Yet it would form one day, and never be interrupted by a night of total darkness. It would also be known unto the Lord, as to the degrees of its light, and the term of its continuance; and he would watch over it, and take care of his cause and people during all the time of it. But his people would hardly know whether to call it day or night, or a compound of both; yet at length, towards the evening of the world, "the Sun of righteousness" would break forth, and shine with unclouded splendor, dispelling the gloom of ignorance,

heresy, idolatry, and superstition; and illuminating the church, and the earth, with knowledge, righteousness, peace, and consolation. (Marg. and Marg. Ref. r-u.—Notes, Isa. 9:6, 7, v. 7. 30:26. 60:15:22. Dan. 2:44, 45. 7:8:11:31-45. Hos. 3:4, 5. 6:1-3. Rev. 11:3-14. 19:11-21. 20:1-6). . . . No longer would they . . . be divided into a number of sects and parties: but they would be all of one mind, to worship that one "name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," into which all Christians are baptized.—This interpretation evidently accords with various other prophecies, both in the Old and New Testament, and with the history of the Christian church, which records the fulfilment of those prophecies."

But the idea of a complete restoration from the apostasy is not only found in Scripture prophecy; such a restoration is actually being effected by a present-day movement which is affecting the entire Christian world.

3. **A Return to the Scriptures.**—As the apostasy rejected the Word and the Spirit of God, the rightful rulers of God's people, for human traditions and human ecclesiasticism, so two aspects of reformation are necessary, the rejection of human creeds and of human ecclesiasticism in favor of the Word and Spirit of God. Creeds have fallen into disfavor generally. Throughout the Christian world may be discerned a growing tendency to repudiate them. Rationalists substitute for creeds their own speculations, but devout Christians are returning to the Scriptures as the source of truth.

In theory the Reformation of the sixteenth century accepted the voice of the Scriptures instead of the voice of the Romish Church. In some degree the Scriptures actually were so accepted. But with the perpetuation of human ecclesiasticism, human creeds soon began to supplant the Scriptures as the rule of faith for Christians. As a result the truth has often been obscured, and such limitations have been placed upon Christians' faith that further light was excluded by the creedal statements to which men were bound. The rejection of creeds and the exaltation of the Scriptures to their rightful place is resulting in bringing Christians to a standard of truth acceptable to all. Even though all may not see alike on every point immediately, yet with the elimination of creeds which are divisive in their nature, and the teaching of the truth of the Scriptures by Spirit-

filled ministers, the natural result is for Christians to come into "the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God."

4. **Rejection of Human Ecclesiasticism.**—In view of what has been said of the nature of the church, it is evident that complete restoration of the church must include the rejection of human ecclesiasticism. Christian unity can never be attained by means of human organization. No union of the sects can effect it. A federation of the denominations would be merely to effect a world-church similar in nature, as far as human organization and government is concerned, to the Romish Church prior to the sixteenth century. A superorganization for the purpose of uniting the sects would be but another step in human ecclesiasticism. Moreover, since many true Christians are not members of any sect, such a federation of the sects would not include all true Christians as does the New Testament church. Also it would include many persons which are unconverted and consequently not members of the church of God.

Christian unity is inconsistent with human ecclesiasticism. To have the former, the latter must be rejected. To reject this means for Christians to separate themselves from humanly organized churches, or to cease to be members. Such is the only attitude they can take that is consistent with the teaching of the Scriptures. Those who so separate themselves stand where salvation placed them and where the early church stood. When a company of them associate themselves for worship they constitute a true local church of God and any other Christian who likewise repudiates human ecclesiasticism will find no walls about that local church which in their nature exclude him. He can subscribe to their creed, which is the Scriptures. He can approve their church government, which is by the Holy Spirit.

Such a repudiation of human ecclesiasticism is actually taking place. The true church is being restored. This present reformation is not of men, but of God. A comparison of this movement with former great movements of God shows its similarity as to method. In the early church when the proper time came for carrying the gospel to the Gentiles the Holy Ghost began to lead many persons to that undertaking. Stephen advocated it in Jerusalem. Philip preached to the Samaritans and was led supernaturally to the Ethiopian. Peter was directed to Cornelius, and certain unnamed Christians converted many

Gentiles at Antioch. After all this the Holy Ghost sent forth Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to the conquest of the Gentile world. The Reformation of the sixteenth century was not accomplished by Luther, but by God through many. Wyclif and Huss received the divine inspiration for such a reformation long before Luther's time. In his own time Luther was but one among several reformers such as Zwingli, Calvin, and thousands whose names are unknown to history but whose hearts were stirred by the divine Spirit that wrought the Reformation.

At the present time there is a general movement of God among Christians for unity, as has been shown. As in the Lutheran Reformation there were many who had the impulse of reformation yet whose efforts were inconsistent with God's methods, so now there are those who see the need of reformation but attempt it by unscriptural methods. Yet the Spirit is actually gathering out a people from the humanly organized churches who are standing in the Bible church alone as did the primitive saints. If it be objected that they must necessarily constitute a sect themselves, let it be said in reply that they may as truly stand in the church of God only, apart from humanly organized sects, as did the early Christians. If they repudiate that human ecclesiasticism which is the fundamental cause of sect organizations, their association together does not constitute them a sect, but they are members of the true catholic church.

Chapter IV

ORDINANCES OF THE CHURCH

The New Testament ordinances are certain divinely appointed outward observances which are significant of spiritual truths of the gospel. The Old Testament religion was one great system of outward ceremonies. These have been abolished. The Christian religion also has its symbolic rites, fewer and simpler than those given by Moses, but more expressive. Romanists hold a much larger number of ordinances than do most Protestants. Their ordinances, or sacraments as they call them, are seven in number—ordination, confirmation, matrimony, extreme unction, penance, baptism, and the eucharist. The first five of these are not properly classed with the two latter as ordinances. The criteria of an ordinance have been well described by Harvey as, "1. An outward symbol divinely appointed to represent a great fact or truth of the gospel and the personal relation of the recipient to that fact or truth. 2. A divine requirement, making its obligation universal and perpetual." The first five sacraments of the Romish church as above named lack in whole or in part these criteria.

From an early date the ordinances were regarded as efficacious in actually conferring saving grace upon those who participated in them. This view has persisted to the present time, not only among Roman Catholics, but also in various Protestant communions. It is so represented in their statements of faith. But neither the Scriptures nor reason furnish any ground for supposing salvation may be obtained by any physical means. The common sense of mankind instinctively repudiates the idea that any magical efficacy exists in any outward rite that of itself can confer spiritual grace. But though the ordinances do not confer grace, yet they are evidently a *means* of grace. They are a means of grace in the same sense as is the preaching of the gospel. In the Christian ordinances God has set forth certain fundamental truths of religion. In the preaching of the gospel these truths are addressed to the ear, but in the ordinances they are represented to the eye in visible form by means of material symbols. Augustine well said, "A sacrament is the word of God made visible." As preaching is instrumental in salvation and spiritual edification, so are the ordinances. Because they

are divinely given representations of certain central truths *of* Christianity no variation in the form of their observance from that represented in the Scriptures is permissible. Any such perversion of the forms of the ordinances is as objectionable as to change the words of the Scriptures. If we have no authority to change the words of Jesus, "Ye must be born again," certainly we have no right to change the form of baptism by which the new birth is symbolized.

Christians are under obligation to keep the ordinances because their observance is divinely enjoined. The commandments to keep them are not of the nature of moral precepts, but are positive precepts. Like all positive precepts, the divine requirement is the only ground of obligation. Moral duties are obligatory upon us because of the very nature of things, but not so are positive duties. Obedience to positive commandments requires a literal performance of the specific action enjoined in the spirit of true obedience. These are facts overlooked by anti-ordinance advocates. They also assume that all ordinances were abolished at the advent of the Holy Ghost. They suppose the ordinances represented as being done away in Col. 2:14-22 are the Christian ordinances. But verse 16 shows clearly that these were the Old Testament ordinances which were concerned with meat, drink, holy days, new moons, and Sabbath-days. That the New Testament ordinances are not included is evident from the fact that they are constantly enjoined and observed subsequently to the death of Christ. The Great Commission specifically commands baptism for all who believe among all nations (Matt. 28:19). Peter commanded Cornelius and his household to be baptized (Acts 10:47, 48). Ananias told Paul to "arise and be baptized" (Acts 22:16). The thousands converted at Pentecost were commanded by Peter to be baptized (Acts 2:38). Philip baptized the Samaritans (Acts 8:16), also the Ethiopian (v. 38). Paul baptized certain Corinthians (1 Cor. 1:13-17). That these apostolic preachers were not in error concerning the observance of ordinances after Pentecost is certain from the fact that years after that time the Lord himself made known to Paul how the Lord's Supper is to be kept (1 Cor. 11:23).

I. Baptism

1. **The Form of Baptism.**—In the light of the clear statements of the Scriptures on the subject, Christian baptism is here con-

ceived of as immersion of a believer in water in token of his having previously been regenerated. That immersion is the true form of baptism may be shown by several distinct classes of proofs.

(1) *The Original Word.* We are dependent principally upon the meaning of the words employed by the Bible for its meaning, as is true of any other written record. But the term "baptize" is not a translation of the original word, but is that original term transferred and anglicized. To determine the meaning of the word in our English Bible we must therefore inquire concerning the sense of the Greek term, which is βαπτίζω (*baptizo*).

In the absence of evidence to the contrary it is proper to assume that the writers of the New Testament employed this term in its usual sense. What that was is known from the Greek classics and the Septuagint. The classics use the term βαπτίζω (*baptizo*) or its derivatives only to express the idea of immersion or entire covering of the person or thing of which it is used. Βαπτίζω (*baptizo*) is defined "to dip in or under water" by Liddell and Scott, who are acknowledged lexical authorities in classical Greek. A leading classical editor, Dr. Anthon, says of *baptizo,* "The primary meaning of the word is to dip or immerse; and its secondary meanings, if it ever had any, all refer in some way or other to the same leading idea. Sprinkling, etc., are entirely out of the question." The most eminent authorities on the usage of the classics have ever agreed with the foregoing quotations. In the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, βαπτίζω (*baptizo*) is used two times: Naaman "*dipped* himself seven times in Jordan" (2 Kings 5:14); and "transgression overwhelms, or immerses, me" (Isa. 21:4). In neither of these texts is any ground furnished on which to question that immersion is the sense of βαπτίζω (*baptizo*).

With no evidence of any other sense of the term either in the classics or the Septuagint, the presumption is clear that the New Testament sense βαπίτζω (*baptizo*) is to immerse. That this is its sense is the testimony of the highest lexical authorities, as the following quotations show. Liddell and Scott: *Greek-English Lexicon*—"βαπτίζω, to dip in or under water." Thayer: *Greek-English Lexicon of the New testament*—"βαπίτζω, properly, to dip repeatedly, to immerge, submerge." Green: *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*—"Βαπίτζω (*baptizo*),

to dip, immerse." Greenfield: *Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*—"Βαπίτζω (*baptizo*), to immerse, immerge, submerge, sink." Sophocles (a native Greek and professor of Harvard University): *Lexicon of the Greek of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*—"Βαπίτζω (*baptizo*), to dip, to immerse, to sink. There is no evidence that Luke and Paul and the other writers of the New Testament put upon this verb meanings not recognized by the Greeks." Scores of other Greek Lexicons might be quoted, many of them by men whose church creed supports sprinkling for baptism, but all of them agree with the foregoing quotations. In further support of this sense of the original word for baptize might be cited multitudes of other quotations by eminent scholars in etymological dictionaries, Bible dictionaries, encyclopedias, religious encyclopedias, and quotations from the Greek classics, the church fathers, different versions of the New Testament, noted commentators, great theologians, and historians of high authority. But these would constitute a volume in themselves and space forbids their citation here. All attempts to show that the word has another meaning than immersion are labored arguments from alleged exceptional usage and that in the New Testament the word is used out of its ordinary meaning. But historical, Biblical, and philological proofs are against such reasoning. If the act of baptizing were by sprinkling, then we should expect that the inspired writers would have used that common Greek term ῥαίνω (*rhaino*) which means sprinkle. If pouring were intended the ordinary word ἐκχέω (*ekcheo*), meaning pour, should have been used. But neither of these words is ever used of Christian baptism. To say the Holy Spirit passed by these two words and employed a word which commonly meant immerse in the sense of sprinkle or pour is to reflect severely on his divine wisdom.

But the most certain proof of the meaning of the term Βαπτίζω (*baptizo*) is that found in the New Testament itself. The constructions in which the word occurs, the conditions under which the act was performed, what is said of the act itself, and figurative uses of the term all furnish evidence of immersion. These proofs will appear in what follows.

(2) *Prepositions Used With the Term.* Thirteen times Βαπτίζω (*baptizo*), with the term expressing the element, is used with the preposition ἐν (*en*), translated *in*. Examples are

as follows: "And were all baptized of him *in* [ἐν (*en*)] the river of Jordan" (Mark 1:5); "I indeed baptize you *with* [ἐν (*en*), "in," A. S. V.] water. . . . He shall baptize you *with* [ἐν (*en*), "in," A. S. V.] the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 3:11). In common usage ἐν (*en*) has the sense of *in*. In the first of the foregoing quotations this translation is required by the context. In the last two the element used is the question under consideration; therefore *with* may be used, but evidently *in* is a better rendering, for which reason it is given in the Revision, even though many of the revisers held sprinkling as Christian baptism.

Another preposition is used in connection with the Greek term for baptize in Mark 1:9: "Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John *in* Jordan." Here the Greek preposition rendered in is εἰς (*eis*) and is properly translated *into* as is done in the margin of the Revised Version. Εἰς (*eis*) signifies motion from without to within. Therefore the river of Jordan was not sprinkled or poured upon Jesus, but he was immersed in it.

(3) *Circumstances for Baptizing.* It is frequently specifically stated in connection with the baptisms described in the New Testament that they occurred where there was a body of water sufficient for immersion, from which the inference is clear in connection with other evidence that the mode was immersion. John usually baptized in Jordan, which was the largest river of Palestine, varying in width from seventy-five to one hundred and fifty feet and in depth from three to twelve feet. Again it is said that John baptized in Enon because there was "much water" there. But if he had been sprinkling people there would have been no need of his restricting his ministrations to the Jordan or Enon. He might have baptized at almost any point in Palestine. But "much water" was a reason for his baptizing in those particular places. The inference is clear that the much water was needed for immersion.

As Philip and the Ethiopian journeyed along the desert road leading from Jerusalem to Gaza they came to "a certain water," a body of water. It was large enough for both men to be able to go down into it. Three roads lead from Jerusalem to Gaza. The one through Hebron passes many streams and pools ample for immersion. Tradition holds that the great fountain of Bethzur, on another road, is the place of the eunuch's immersion.

But a third road which passes through Beit Jibrin and is in some places desert is referred to by Dr. Robinson as probably the road in question and the water which he says he saw standing in the bottom of an adjacent wady is evidence that the immersion of the Eunuch might well have taken place here. (See Researches, Vol. II., note 32.) The fact that Paul and Silas took the Philippian jailer out of his house to baptize him is also ground for believing that he was immersed. See Acts 16:32, 34.

It is said of Jesus when he was baptized that he came "up out of the water." Concerning the baptism of the Ethiopian by Philip it is stated that "they went down both into the water"; and when the baptism was accomplished it is said, "and when they were come up out of the water." In both these instances the baptism was performed while the subject was in the water, most naturally implying immersion. But it is objected that εἰς (*eis*), into, and ἐκ (*ek*), out of, mean only *to* and *from*, that they do not imply an actual entering of the water, but only coming near it and withdrawing. But the same word is translated "into" in Matt. 25:46, "These shall go away into [εἰς (*eis*)] everlasting punishment: but the righteous into [εἰς (*eis*)] life eternal." If the objection be valid this latter text gives no assurance of heaven to the righteous and no certainty of punishment to the wicked. Jesus was "baptized of John in [εἰς (*eis*) into] the Jordan." That εἰς (*eis*) and ἐκ (*ek*) when used in contrasted relation mean into and out of is affirmed by Winer, Meyer, Farrar, Olshausen, Bloomfield, and Campbell.

(4) *Other Scripture Proofs.* The figurative usage of the term "baptize" also furnishes evidence of the form of the literal baptism. Jesus said, "Are ye able . . . to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" (Matt. 20:22, 23). Also, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" (Luke 12:50). Here Christ's sufferings at the time of his betrayal and death are represented as being so overwhelmingly great as to be termed a baptism of suffering. It is the magnitude of the suffering that constituted it a baptism. This is clearly implied in the words to James and John. But if baptism consisted in merely a few drops of water sprinkled upon the subject, then the figure would be wholly incongruous. There would be no proper comparison. But the idea of the body overwhelmed by water is a striking figure of

the intense agony of Gethsemane and of Calvary which came upon him in overwhelming measure. In commenting on this expression Lange says, "*To be baptized:* An image of the depth and intensity of his suffering, like a baptism performed by immersion."

"All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Cor. 10: 1, 2). Here the words "under" and "through" tell the exact position of the Israelites when they are said to have been baptized. As Israel was under the cloud and within the limits of the sea, which stood like a wall on either side, so baptism is a passing under the water. Alford says: They "entered by the act of such immersion into a solemn covenant with God, and became his church under the law as given by Moses, God's servant—just as we Christians by our baptism are bound in solemn covenant with God. . . . The allegory is obviously not to be pressed minutely, for neither did they *enter* the cloud nor were they *wetted* by the waters of the sea; but they passed under both, as the baptized passes under the water."

Throughout the sixth chapter of Romans the Apostle seeks to show that one who has been regenerated should not commit sin. He reasons thus: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life" (vs. 3, 4). Here the Apostle states that the Christian can not consistently sin, because he has died to the life of sin and risen to a new life in Christ. As Christ died, was buried, and arose to a life of glory in heaven, so the Christian's separation from sin and regeneration in order to a new life of holiness is symbolized by the figurative burial in the water of baptism and his being raised therefrom to live a new life. But sprinkling can not be a symbolic burial and resurrection; therefore the mode of baptism as Paul knew it was immersion, which is comparable both to Christ's death and resurrection, and also to the believer's death to sin and resurrection to holiness. That the passage under consideration is descriptive of the mode of primitive baptism is admitted by leading commentators, including some of those whose denominations favor sprinkling. Conybeare and Howson say,

"This passage can not be understood unless it be understood that the primitive baptism was by immersion." Dr. Shaff says, "All commentators of note (except Stuart and Hodge) expressly admit, or take it for granted, that in this verse . . . the ancient prevailing mode of baptism by immersion and emersion is implied as giving additional force to the going down of the old man and the rising up of the new man."

(5) *The Testimony of History.* The writings of the early church fathers furnish conclusive evidence that baptism was by immersion in the early Christian centuries. The quotation of a few passages from very many left us by the early fathers is sufficient proof. Tertullian says of baptism, "A man is let down into the water, and while a few words are spoken is immersed." Hermas says, "This seal is water, into which men descend appointed to death, but from which they ascend appointed to life." Clement says in Fragment from Eusebius, Book IV., chapter 62, A Christian is one who knows God, who believes in Christ, who possesses the grace of God, and who has been dipped in the sacred laver." Basil, A. D. 320, "Imitating the burial of Christ by the baptism; for the bodies of those immersed are, as it were, buried in the water."

All reliable church historians concur in stating that immersion was the primitive mode of baptism. In writing on the first century Fisher says, *History of the Christian Church,* p. 41: "The ordinary mode of baptism was by immersion." *Mosheim, Ecclesiastical History,* Vol. 1, Part II, Chapter 5: "In this [the first] century baptism was administered, in convenient places, without the public assemblies; and by immersing the candidates wholly in water." *Neander, Church History,* Vol. 1., Section III, Part IV: "In respect to the form of baptism, it was in conformity to the original institution and the original import of the symbol, performed by immersion, only in cases of the sick by sprinkling." *Shaff, History of the Apostolic Church,* Vol. II, Book IV: "Finally, as to the outward *mode* of administering this ordinance; immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original, normal form." *Coleman, Christian Antiquities,* Chronological Index.—"*Immersion* or *dipping.* In the primitive church this was undeniably the common mode of baptism. The utmost that can be said of sprinkling in that early period is, that it was, in case of necessity, permitted as an ex-

ception to the general rule." From the foregoing and many other fathers and church historians who might be cited, it is clear that sprinkling or pouring was not considered valid except in case of the impossibility of immersion. And G. P. Fisher states that there is no record of sprinkling or pouring for baptism until the second century, which was when ritualism began to become prominent.

An erroneous idea is all too prevalent that sprinkling supplanted immersion as baptism from the time sprinkling began to be practised. The fact is that in the Eastern churches it has never supplanted immersion and in the West immersion was the *common mode of baptism until the thirteenth century.* Thomas Aquinas, who was a leading theological writer of the Church of Rome in the middle of that century, though defending sprinkling, said, "The symbol of Christ's burial is more expressively represented by immersion, and for that reason this mode of baptizing is *more common* and commendable . . . . It is safer to baptize by immersion because *this is the more common use.*" *Hagenbach, History of Doctrines,* Vol. 2: "From the thirteenth century, sprinkling came into more general use in the West. The Greek church, however, and the Church of Milano still retain the practise of immersion." Brenner (A Roman Catholic), *Historical Exhibition of the Administration of Baptism from Christ to Our Times*: "Thirteen hundred years was baptism generally and regularly an immersion of the person under the water, and only in extraordinary cases a sprinkling or pouring with water; the latter was, moreover, disputed as a mode of baptism, nay, even forbidden."

Romish theologians do not pretend to hold that sprinkling has the support of Scripture or that it was practised by the early church, but regard it as valid solely on the ground that the church has the right to change ceremonies. The reformers continued the practise of sprinkling because it had become the common mode in their day. Yet Luther in his *De Sacramento Baptismi,* and Calvin in his *Institutes,* state that immersion was the original and Scriptural mode. In the English church where immersion was the common mode prior to the Reformation, that mode was continued until 1549, when sprinkling began to be admitted for weak children. The law of the English church even to the present day recommends immersion as the regular mode,

but the practise of it has become the exception. Though the Presbyterian Church teaches and practises affusion as baptism, yet Dr. Lightfoot, who presided over the Westminster Assembly when the Confession of Faith was formed states that a change of one vote would have made immersion rather than pouring the rule of the Presbyterian Church (*Works,* Vol. 13, p. 299). So great was the number of those who favored immersion in the Westminster Assembly.

(6) *Practise of the Eastern Churches.* The Greek churches have always practised immersion and do at the present time. They baptize infants, but always by the mode of immersion. In some of these churches Greek has always been the vernacular; therefore they have been better qualified to define the meaning of the term and less liable to vary their practise from its true significance. Their rigid adherence to immersion and absolute repudiation of other forms is a strong argument for their practise being the Biblical and primitive form. *The Russian Catechism* of the Greek Orthodox Church says on baptism, "This they hold to be a point *necessary,* that no part of the child be undipped in water." In *Ancient Christianity,* Chapter XIX., Coleman says, "The Eastern Church has uniformly retained the form of immersion as indispensable to the validity of the ordinance, and they repeat the rite wherever they have received to their communion persons who have been baptized in another manner."

(7) *Evidence of the Baptisteries.* A class of material proofs of the early practise of immersion is the ancient baptisteries found in all parts of ancient Christendom. These are found in the churches themselves or in an adjacent building for the purpose. These date as early as the fourth century and as late as the thirteenth. In his work on *Baptism and Baptisteries,* Dr. Cote states that these are in diameter sometimes as much as twenty-five feet and in depth usually more than three feet. Doubtless these ancient baptisteries were made and used for immersion. Their size and proportions, also the steps by which one might descend into them, are clear evidences that they were not intended for sprinkling or pouring.

(8) *Objections to Immersion Considered.* The large amount of positive evidence that immersion is baptism is reason enough for passing by any objection to the validity of that mode. Those who practise other modes almost all admit that immersion is

valid baptism. But they affirm that this is not the only valid mode. They allow that immersion was practised by the apostolic church, but hold that it was not uniformly practised. In support of their theory they attempt to show that the term Βαπτίζω (*baptizo*) may include sprinkling, as well as immersion. But they fail to prove this point and in view of the strong proofs to the contrary already stated we need not take space here for a detailed discussion of their reasoning.

A common objection to immersion is that the mode is not essential and that a little water applied to the believer is as good as if he were immersed in much. It is reasoned that even though primitive baptism was immersion, yet because it is but an outward rite the church has the right to change its form. But God has not granted to any man the liberty to change any divinely instituted ordinance. Because baptism is designed to symbolize certain gospel truths, therefore to change its form so it fails accurately to represent those truths is not less objectionable than to change the words of Scripture, which are another divinely chosen means of exhibiting the truth. As strict adherence to the divine form was important to the proper construction of the Mosaic tabernacle (Heb. 8:5) because it was symbolic, so strict adherence to the divinely given form of baptism is important to Christian baptism.

Again it is objected that immersion is inconvenient and sometimes dangerous. But there is no reason for believing God makes man's convenience the first point of importance in establishing ordinances. Doubtless most, if not all, the many ceremonial requirements of the Mosaic law were inconvenient for observance. This must have been true of the observance of the Sabbath by the busy farmer, or of the great loss of time in making three annual pilgrimages to Jerusalem to the great feasts, also of the many cleansings and sacrifices required. It may rather be reasoned that in giving a positive command to test man's obedience, God would especially choose one that would involve inconvenience to those who observe it. Yet opposers of immersion are liable to overstress the inconvenience of immersion. Those who believe in immersion do not usually find its observance a matter of great inconvenience. Likewise the danger of going into the water is often overestimated by objectors to immersion. No ill effects as to health are found to follow the practise of

immersion by those who practise it, and it sometimes brings physical benefit. If one is dying or too sick to be immersed, he is under no obligation to be baptized. It is not a saving ordinance; therefore if its observance is not possible it is not required.

But it is further objected that immersion would have been impossible in some of the baptisms described in the Scriptures. The objector affirms that for lack of time John the Baptist could never have immersed all the multitudes who came to be baptized by him, and that there was neither enough time nor sufficient water in Jerusalem to immerse the three thousand converts on the day of Pentecost. In reply let it be remarked first that if the same words are repeated in each instance, but little if any more time will be required for immersing a person than is needed to sprinkle him. No figures are given as to the exact number baptized by John, for which reason the objector can not properly say he could not have immersed all whom he is said to have baptized. As to the time necessary for the baptizing of the three thousand at Jerusalem, if all the ministers, the Twelve and the Seventy, whom Jesus had employed prior to that time were present, which is probable, there would have been but thirty-seven persons for each minister to immerse. Even if only the Twelve were engaged in their baptizing the entire three thousand might easily have been baptized in a few hours' time.

It is certain that in Jerusalem there was no lack of water in which to immerse them, as has often been wrongly affirmed. Jerusalem has no large stream near it, but it has many large pools or artificial lakes, any one of which might have served for the immersion of the three thousand. The Bible mentions some of these pools by name. The dimensions of six of them are given in feet by Dr. Robinson as follows: "Pool of Bethesda 360x130x75 deep; Upper Gihon 316x200 to 218x18 deep at the ends; Lower Gihon 592x245 to 275x35 to 42 at ends; Pool of Hezekiah 240x144; Pool of Siloam 53x18x19 deep; The Kings Pool 15x6" (Researches, Vol. 1, pp. 328-348). The gradually descending sides of these by successive platforms afford convenience for bathing or baptizing.

(9) *Sprinkling and Pouring.* As the Greek Βαπτίζω (*baptizo*) has been shown to signify immersion, so the common Greek terms signifying sprinkle and pour are never used of Christian

baptism. Uncritical persons sometimes attempt to find support for sprinkling for baptism in certain texts in which the word sprinkle occurs. "So shall he sprinkle many nations." According to the preceding verse it is Christ who is to sprinkle those nations. But baptism is performed by the preachers. The text does not state that this is a baptism, nor is the sprinkling said to be with water. As the ceremonial cleansings under the Mosaic law were accomplished by the sprinkling of the sacrificial blood about on the altar of God, so Christ's blood is represented as sprinkled upon men's hearts in order to their cleansing from sin. See Heb. 12:24; 10:22; 1 Pet. 1:2. That the text under consideration refers to such sprinkling is evident from the preceding verse in which the sufferings of Jesus are described. Another text supposed to teach sprinkling as baptism is Ezek. 36:25, 26. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you." The sprinkling here, as in the preceding text, is divinely accomplished. It evidently is not a mere sprinkling of water, which could not cleanse from moral filthiness and idols. Only the blood of Christ can do this.

The argument for pouring as baptism is principally a reasoning from analogy. The Holy Spirit baptism is said to be by a pouring out of the Holy Spirit on the subject; therefore it is reasoned that water baptism must be by a pouring out of water upon him who is baptized with water. The argument will not stand careful scrutiny. First, such a conclusion ignores all the positive proofs which have been set forth that baptism is immersion. Second, the supposed analogy does not exist. The Holy Spirit is a person, not a mere substance that may be measured and separated as water. Therefore the pouring out of him must be figurative. In the discussion concerning the baptism by the Holy Spirit in a former chapter, the nature of the outpouring of the Spirit was shown to be literally only an overwhelming measure of his working in and through the subject. It is properly represented as a baptism and an outpouring when contrasted with the operation of the Spirit through men in a lesser degree in pre-Christian times. As in immersion in water one is overwhelmed, so in the baptism by the Holy Spirit his operation and influence is in overwhelming measure.

(10) *Trine Immersion.* Trine, or threefold, immersion has been practised not only by certain Protestant bodies, but has been widely practised in the Eastern churches from an early date. Doubtless the two extra dips were added when the simple act of baptism began to be surrounded by that elaborate ritual which has been described as marking the early stages of the apostasy.

But the Scriptures do not require nor favor trine immersion. Those who practise it depend for Scriptural support upon the baptismal formula as found in the Great Commission. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 28:19). They assume that three actions are here commanded because baptism is to be in the names of the three persons. But the construction requires no such interpretation, neither are similar constructions elsewhere so interpreted. The simplest and best disproof of the trine immersionist's interpretation of this text is its comparison with parallel constructions in other texts. "And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 8:11). As three distinct persons are named in the baptismal formula, so three distinct persons are named in this text. As an act is enjoined in relation to each of these persons of the divine Trinity, so is an act to be performed in relation to each of the patriarchs named. But if a separate immersion is required for each member of the Trinity, then there must be three sittings down in the kingdom of heaven, for the construction is the same. Those coming into the kingdom must sit down first with Abraham, arise and sit down with Isaac, and again arise and sit down a third time with Jacob. But all who are familiar with the use of language know no such repeated sitting and rising is taught. Likewise trine immersion is not taught in the baptismal formula.

"For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels" (Luke 9:26). Here is an elliptical sentence of similar construction to the baptismal formula. If the latter teaches three dips, the former must teach three distinct comings of Christ—the first in his own glory, the second in the Father's glory, and the

third in the glory of the angels. But we know it does not teach three comings of Christ, and therefore deny that the Commission enjoins trine immersion.

Further reason for rejecting trine immersion is that the apostles usually baptized only in the name of the Lord Jesus. "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 2:38). Others were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts 10:48; 8:16; 19:5). With such a formula trine immersion is excluded. Also since baptism is symbolic of cleansing from sin and of a death to sin, burial, and resurrection to newness of life a plurality of immersions is incongruous with that symbolized. Had Jesus intended three immersions he would have so plainly stated it, as repetition in Old Testament ordinance is clearly specified. Because he has not commanded three dips we have no obligation to so practise and should not so practise baptism.

2. **Subjects of Baptism.**—The question as to who are proper subjects for baptism, like the question concerning the mode, has been the subject of much controversy. The unscriptural practises which have led to differences concerning both of these points had their beginning in a departure from the faith in the early period of the great apostasy. The principal question for consideration under this heading is concerning the baptism of infants.

(1) *Only the Regenerated Eligible.* Throughout the New Testament baptism is represented as being for those who have been already regenerated, or who have repented and believed, which are the conditions for and which imply regeneration. It may be assumed that John the Baptist refused to baptize certain impenitent Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt. 3:8, 9). On the day of Pentecost, "Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you" (Acts 2:38). All those who were baptized were believers. "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women" (Acts 8:12). Those who were baptized were old enough to understand and believe the gospel message—they were "men and women." They believed before they were baptized. "And many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized" (Acts 18:8). It was even after Paul and Cornelius had received the baptism

of the Holy Ghost that they were baptized. Because repentance and faith are prerequisite to baptism, infants can not be proper subjects for baptism.

(2) *Arguments for Infant Baptism Considered.* If elaborate argument is desirable in refuting infant baptism it certainly can not be because it is supported by strong arguments, but only because of the tenacity with which it is held by its adherents. Its validity is maintained on a variety of grounds, some of which are contradictory to others. Romanists profess to hold it only on the authority of their church and deny that it has any Biblical support. They charge Protestants who practise it with inconsistently following tradition in violation of the Protestant profession that the Scriptures are the proper rule of faith. Luther and other reformers admitted that infant baptism has no New Testament authority, yet they taught and practised it. Many Protestants endeavor to find support for it in the Abrahamic covenant. Some endeavor to find Scripture precepts or example supporting it, while many careful thinkers deny that it can be so upheld, though they allow it on other grounds. If the practise has any sound Scriptural basis, one would suppose all who practise it would have reached a fair measure of agreement as to that basis. The absence of such agreement is ground for the inference that no such Scriptural basis exists. If God had intended infant baptism it is proper to suppose he would have given clear directions concerning it in the Bible.

Matt. 19:13-15 is supposed to support infant baptism. "Then were brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them." But this text states that these little children were brought, not to be baptized, but that he might lay his hands on them. There is no hint that Jesus baptized them. Were it true that he had been practising infant baptism, surely on this occasion near the end of his ministry his disciples would have understood that little children might properly be brought to him for that purpose. The fact that they forbade the bringing of the infants to Jesus is proof that he had not practised nor ordained infant baptism. Another text used to support infant baptism is Acts 2:38, 39. "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your

children.'' But in referring to children (v. 39) it is not baptism that is promised, but the ''Holy Ghost.'' Therefore if ''children'' here means infants, then these may receive the Holy Spirit with all that is implied in receiving him. But ''children'' here is used in the sense merely of posterity. It is often so used in the Scriptures.

Much is made also by those who favor infant baptism of the baptism of households such as that of Lydia (Acts 16:15), of the jailer (vs. 32-34), and of Stephanas (1 Cor. 1:16). It has been assumed there were infants in these households and that they were baptized on the faith of the parents. But there is no evidence there were children in any of these families. The family of Lydia are described as ''brethren'' (v. 40), and therefore were not infants. A mother of infant children would scarcely be engaged in business as was Lydia. The jailer's entire family were old enough to believe (v. 34); therefore were not infants. The household of Stephanas are said to have ''addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints'' (1 Cor. 16:15), which implies that they were not infants. Surely these texts prove nothing as to infant baptism. Also the argument for baptism of the entire household on the faith of the parent proves too much, for then must not only infants be baptized but all older sons, daughters, and servants, whether willing or unwilling, saved or unsaved.

A favorite argument for infant baptism with many of its advocates is that the covenant of God with Abraham is perpetual; the new as well as the old dispensation is founded on it. As the natural descendants of Abraham with their natural offspring were included in that covenant and were entitled to circumcision, so the spiritual children of Abraham with their natural children are included in the covenant and are entitled to baptism. This argument is unsound and faulty in that it fails properly to carry out the analogy. A more correct method of reasoning is that as the natural children of Abraham and their natural offspring are in the covenant and therefore should be circumcised, so the spiritual children of Abraham (believers) and their *spiritual* children are included in the covenant and therefore are worthy of baptism. Thus stated the method of reasoning is correct and the conclusion is correct. But when so stated it no longer lends support to infant baptism, but is antag-

onistic to it. Also no proof exists that baptism is a substitute for circumcision in any sense such as that the terms for admission to one are also the terms of admission to the other. This is clear from the fact that only males were circumcised and both males and females are baptized. There is no ground for the assumption that the faith of natural parents entitles children to baptism.

Professor Moses Stuart, himself a supporter of infant baptism, admits, "Commands or plain and certain examples in the New Testament relative to it I do not find."

(3) *Objections to Infant Baptism.* No proof can be produced that infant baptism was practised prior to the third century. Tertullian, in his work *De Baptisma,* which was written near the year 200 A. D., strongly opposed the baptism of children, referring not merely to new-born infants but rather to children somewhat older. Certainly if he considered such were not to be baptized, the baptism of infants was not a common practise. In his *Commentary on Acts,* Meyer says, "Concerning infant baptism, there is no witness before Tertullian, and it did not become general until after the time of Augustine. In his *Church History,* Vol. I, p. 401, Shaff says in speaking of the post-Nicene age, "Notwithstanding the general admission of infant baptism, the practise of it was by no means universal."

Proof has been previously given that the New Testament teaches that only believers are proper subjects of baptism. The Great Commission as given by Matthew requires that before one is baptized he is first to be taught or made a disciple, and Mark says, "He that believeth and is baptized." Infants can not be Scriptural subjects for baptism, because they are incapable of being taught and also of believing.

A well-founded objection to infant baptism is that it is useless to those who receive it. When it began to be practised it was held to be the means of salvation. It is still so held by Romanists and some others. But the majority of evangelical Christians reject baptismal regeneration, also the idea that unbaptized infants are lost. It is sometimes argued that baptism places the child under the seal of the covenant and makes more probable his conversion later. But no evidence can be given that the conversion of those baptized in infancy is more probable than is the conversion of other children who have not been bap-

tized in infancy. Not only is it a useless practise, but it is also a positively harmful one. Those baptized in infancy too often trust in that baptism as a means of salvation and therefore fail to get awakened to the necessity of repenting of sin and believing on Christ for salvation. Another evil consequence is the large proportion of unconverted church members who are such because of baptism in infancy. A third evil of infant baptism is the perversion of the ordinance so it fails to symbolize the divine truth intended. The lesson it teaches is consequently lost.

3. **Purpose of Baptism.**—The full benefit to be derived from the observance of baptism is not merely the spiritual blessing that results from obedience to a positive commandment of God. Like other ordinances, baptism has a purpose. Only as the true significance of baptism is understood by the subject can he realize the full value of the rite. In some sense it is a salvation from sin. "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38). "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins" (22:16). But in what sense is baptism a cleansing from sin? Evidently it is not a real cleansing from sin, for various reasons.

First, it is clear from the Scriptures that salvation is, in its nature, not dependent upon any outward rite. Our sins are not washed away by the baptismal waters, but by the blood of Christ (Rev. 1:5; 7:14). That blood is applied on the conditions of repentance and faith (John 3:18; Acts 13:39; 1 John 5:1). Also it would be objectionable that one's salvation should be made dependent upon the act of another. If one should truly repent and believe on Christ for pardon, but no qualified person was available to immerse him, who will dare to say if such an one should die unbaptized he would be lost? The penitent thief on the cross had no opportunity for baptism, but Jesus assured him of salvation nevertheless. Again, baptism is not a means to nor a prerequisite to salvation. The apostle Paul was converted and even received his call to preach on the Damascus road (Acts 26:13-18). Three days later at the hands of Ananias he received the Holy Ghost, "whom the world can not receive." It was after all this that Ananias urged his baptism to wash away his sins. But his sins had certainly been washed away actually prior to that time. Therefore the washing away of sin here intended can be only a ceremonial cleansing. Another example

of conversion and of the reception of the Holy Spirit prior to baptism is that of Cornelius. He was devout; he feared God, prayed alway, gave much alms, and was a "just man." Later he received the Holy Ghost. Still later Peter baptized him.

The outward washing by water in baptism is a symbolic washing from the defilement of sin. It is salvation in figure as were some of the Old Testament ordinances. After speaking of the salvation of Noah in the Ark from the flood, which is represented as a figure of our salvation from sin, the apostle Peter says, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us" (1 Pet. 3:21). Here baptism is specifically represented as a figurative salvation and not the real cleansing from sin.

Baptism also has still further significance. It represents the death and resurrection of Christ as the procuring cause of salvation, and is symbolic of the accomplishment of that purpose in the person who is baptized (Rom. 6:4). It points to both Christ and the believer. It is fitting that the atonement of Christ should be indicated in this rite as the means of salvation. The immersion and emersion from the water of the subject is his testimony to the world that he has died to sin and the world, and that he has been resurrected to a new life of holiness in Christ. But, as is brought out by the apostle Paul, the rising from the watery grave of baptism is a public testimony of belief in the great truth of the resurrection of the body.

Only as immersion is practised, however, are these great truths represented. Those who pervert the mode lose in a great measure the significance and benefit of baptism, however sincere they may be in its observance. Not only because its practise is commanded, but especially because of its significance, its proper observance is important and should not be neglected.

4. **The Essentials of Baptism.**—A few things are necessary to the validity of baptism, while many others often connected with the rite are not necessary. A running stream or natural body of water in which to baptize is not essential. Doubtless the baptisms in Jerusalem were in artificial pools, as that city possesses no natural stream or pools sufficient for baptizing. Immersion in a baptistery in the house of worship is valid baptism. The position of the body is not important. The action in baptizing may be either forward or backward. It is usually performed backward, as in a burial, by single immersionists. The adminis-

trator of baptism need not be an ordained minister. However in the nature of things and also according to the examples of Scripture it is properly the work of ministers when they are available. The particular formula in the Commission need not be repeated verbatim in baptizing. The New Testament baptisms were often performed in the name of the Lord Jesus. Neither is the validity of baptism dependent upon the extent of the subject's knowledge of the significance of baptism, or other divine truth. Nor is one's baptism invalid because of a lack of understanding and support of correct Scripture doctrine in all respects on the part of the administrator.

The essentials are: (1) That the subject be truly regenerated; (2) That he be entirely immersed in the water; (3) That he be immersed in the water in the name of the Trinity, or of Christ, and emersed therefrom; (4) That the subject believe the administrator to be a Christian. The subject can have no further responsibility than this concerning the administrator. Only as baptism meets these requirements is it valid.

II. The Lord's Supper

The Lord's Supper is properly so designated (1 Cor. 11:20) because it was instituted by him and is in some sense a partaking of him. It is also called the communion supper (1 Cor. 10:16) because of the common participation of Christians in it, and it is called the eucharist because of the giving of thanks (1 Cor. 11:24). The Lord's Supper is here conceived to be the eating and drinking by Christians, when assembled for the purpose, of the broken bread and poured out wine which are symbols of the broken body and shed blood of Christ, through which we have spiritual life.

1. **A Christian Ordinance.**—The institution of the Lord's Supper is described at length in four passages. (Matt. 26:25-30; Mark 14:22-26; Luke 22:19, 20; 1 Cor. 11:23-29). The fullest statement concerning its institution and observance is that by the apostle Paul. While eating the last Passover with his disciples, Jesus took bread from the table, gave thanks to God, and parting it gave it to his disciples telling them to eat it. Then he took wine and distributed it among them. These were in some sense his body and blood. This rite was to be observed in commemoration of his death.

That Jesus intended in that first communion supper to establish a rite for universal and perpetual observance is shown by his words, "This do in remembrance of me" (Luke 22:19). The very fact that it was to be observed as a memorial is proof that it was to continue to be celebrated after his death. Its perpetual observance as an ordinance is clearly enjoined by the apostle Paul, who wrote the 1 Corinthian epistle almost thirty years after Jesus' death. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor. 11:26). Yet further evidence that the Lord's Supper is an ordinance is found in the fact that the apostolic churches did observe it (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 10:16; 11:20). Also in all subsequent ages among almost all Christians it has been regarded as an ordinance obligatory on all Christians.

2. **Method of Observance.**—The essentials of the Supper are six: blessing, breaking, pouring, giving, eating, and drinking. The omission of any of these would deprive the rite of its true character and significance. Both the synoptists and Paul gave very special mention of the blessing, or, as Luke and Paul say, the giving of thanks. There is no Scriptural ground for the common assumption that the blessing was of the bread. God was blessed, or thanked, for the elements of the Supper. That this blessing was a giving of thanks is stated in Luke 22:19 and in 1 Cor. 11:24. In the records of Matthew and Mark it is said of the wine that Jesus gave thanks. Nothing is said of blessing it. And according to many respectable manuscripts, Matthew and Mark also state that Jesus gave thanks for the bread. On the account by Matthew, Adam Clarke says, "But what was it that our Lord blessed? Not the *bread,* though many think the contrary, being deceived by the word *it,* which is improperly supplied in our Version. In all the four places referred to above, whether the word 'blessed' or 'gave thanks' is used, it refers not to the *bread,* but to *God,* the dispenser of every good." Because this blessing affords no evidence that the elements were blessed by Christ or by men in the communion supper, there is less ground on which to rest the unscriptural theories of the nature of the Supper such as transubstantiation and consubstantiation.

The breaking of the bread and pouring out of the wine are necessary to signify the breaking of his body and shedding of

his blood in atonement. But also it is necessary that the bread be parted that it may be distributed to and eaten by the participants. Because of the nature of the flat, Oriental loaves the bread was broken, not cut. The essential thing is that the bread be parted for distribution, whether it be broken or cut. Jesus' body was cut rather than broken by the nails and the spear. The eating and drinking are essential in that they signify the relation of the individual to the atonement of Christ. The communion is in both kinds—the bread and the wine. The Romanists in withholding the cup from the laity pervert the ordinance and deny to them the benefit of this aspect of the rite.

The elements Jesus used were unleavened bread and the juice of the grape. That the bread was unleavened is certain from the fact that at the time of the Passover no leaven was permitted to be found in the houses of Israelites. Whether the absence of leaven in the communion bread can be definitely shown to be required is questionable. But inasmuch as leaven is commonly a type of sin in Scripture symbols, it is appropriate that it should not be used in the communion bread, which is symbolic, not only of the sinless Christ, but also of his holy church. Most careful students of the subject affirm that the common wine of Palestine in Jesus' time, as at present, contained a small per cent of alcohol. Though it can not be proved that Jesus did not use such, yet doubtless fermentation of the communion wine is not necessary to the validity of the ordinances, and because of the prevalence of the sin of drunkenness in modern times and the strong sentiment against intoxicants, unfermented grape juice is preferable.

It is stated that Jesus and his disciples "sung an hymn" after the supper (Matt. 26:30), but that hymn was probably the last half of the great hallel (Psa. 113-118, according to Edersheim and others), and was connected with the Passover rather than the Lord's Supper. While the singing of an appropriate hymn may form a proper closing for the Lord's Supper, yet it is not an essential of it. Though it is called a supper and was instituted by Jesus in the evening, yet there is nothing in the nature of it, and no principle or precept of Scripture, that limits its observance to a particular period of the day. Concerning the frequency of the celebration of the Supper the Scriptures are silent. A daily (Acts 2:46) and a weekly (Acts

20:7) observance are assumed to have been practised, but there is no certainty in either instance that this ordinance is referred to, and if so there would be no ground for assuming that such practises are precedents for us to follow. It should not be observed so frequently that it becomes common and unimpressive, neither should it be observed so seldom that its value is missed. Fixed times for its observance are important to avoid its neglect.

It should be celebrated in the assembled church, not by the individual in solitude. Only in the company of others can its observance "show forth" the truth intended. The proper administrators of this ordinance are the divinely appointed officers of the church, the elders and deacons. In the absence of these, however, other devout members of a congregation may be appointed to administer it.

All who are regenerated and therefore members of the church are eligible to partake of the communion supper. Those who walk disorderly are unworthy to partake of it (1 Cor. 11:19), because they are not saved. A common view is that only baptized persons are fit to participate in the communion feast. Those religious bodies who hold baptismal regeneration or who make baptism the mode of entrance to the church consistently conform to that view. But if regeneration precedes baptism and makes one a member of God's church, then in the nature of the case every regenerated person is worthy to partake of the emblems of the broken body and shed blood of Christ. "Close communion" in the modern sense of the term, which excludes all who are not members of and do not accept the creed of a particular denomination is without Scriptural support. On the other hand, those should not participate in the communion supper who have not been converted, or who have backslidden and openly lived a disorderly life.

3. **Purpose of the Supper.**—The Lord's Supper is, like baptism, an outward act symbolic of spiritual experience. As sins can not be cleansed away by literal water in baptism, so the soul can not be fed in any literal sense with material bread and wine. The purpose of the rite is so to represent to the participant and also to others a great and fundamental truth of religion and the participant's relation to that truth that they will be vividly impressed with its reality. Like baptism, the observance of this

ordinance has value as does the preaching of the Word of God, only in a greater degree. As the reading of the Scriptures or hearing them preached edifies the soul, so does the observance of this ordinance edify, and even in a greater measure. Of what then is this ordinance symbolic?

(1) The broken bread and the wine poured forth are symbols of the atoning sufferings and death of Christ. "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." In themselves, apart from their use, they represent the fact of Christ's atonement. (2) The eating of the bread and drinking of the wine by the participant is symbolic of his personal trust in the atonement of Christ, for his individual salvation and for the sustenance of his spiritual life, or the continuation of his acceptance with God. The partaking of the elements symbolizes, not only the fact of our appropriation of the atonement of Christ, but also the method of that appropriation, which is by union with Christ himself. (3) It is a commemoration of the death and sufferings of Christ. "This do in remembrance of me." When a devout person looks upon the symbolic broken body and shed blood of his Savior and in partaking of them is forcibly reminded that his Savior's sufferings were for him, his love and gratitude to Christ are increased. This ordinance is a monument of a great event. As the Passover of the Mosaic dispensation was predictive of the great truth of sacrificial atonement, so the Lord's Supper is commemorative of the same truth. (4) It is also representative of the unity of Christians in the one body, the church. "For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread" (1 Cor. 10:17). As the many fractions of that one loaf are eaten by many, by which they become united in the eating of the one loaf, so because all Christians have partaken of the one Christ and he dwells in all are they all one body. Whatever other benefits may be derived from the observance of this holy rite, at least these truths are symbolized by it.

4. **Erroneous Views.**—This rite has been for many centuries the subject of much error and of fierce controversy. Both Romanists and Protestants have greatly perverted the truth concerning it. The chief point of error is relative to the manner in which Christ is present in the bread and wine, or the meaning of the words, "This is my body. . . . This is my blood." Here

Romanism has erred and here was the point of controversy between the reformers, Luther and Zwingli.

The Romish view is that of transubstantiation. The theory that the bread and wine of the communion supper become, through priestly consecration, the real body and blood of Christ was first set forth in orderly statement in the ninth century, but not until the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215, did it become a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church. As it was later set forth by the Council of Trent the doctrine includes five main points: (1) When the priest speaks the words of consecration over the elements they instantly cease to be bread and wine except in appearance—color, form and taste—and in substance are entirely changed into the real body and blood of Christ just as they existed upon the cross. (2) Because the body necessarily contains the spirit, therefore not only the real body and blood but also the soul and divinity of Christ are contained in the consecrated elements. (3) Because these material elements contain the whole Christ, body, soul, and divinity, therefore, in the mass, the priest offers a proper sacrifice in atonement for sin, which is equally effectual with the death of Christ on the cross in propitiation for sin and in securing divine favor. (4) The elements which have thus become truly Christ are to be worshiped and adored as is God. (5) Because the entire Christ is in each particle of the elements, the receiving of the bread is the receiving of the entire Christ, body, blood, and soul; and because there is danger of the spilling of the blood in the cup if served to the laity, it is to be reserved for the clergy only.

These five points all rest on the theory of transubstantiation. The disproof of it is the disproof of all the other points. For Scriptural support the doctrine depends chiefly upon two texts. (1) "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you" (John 6:53). But these words have no reference to the Lord's Supper, as is evident from their having been spoken long before it was instituted. (2) "This is my body"; "This is my blood" (Matt. 26:26, 28). If these words are to be understood literally, then the doctrine of transubstantiation is Scriptural. But no proof exists that they are to be so interpreted. A common meaning of the verb *to be* is *to signify,* or *to represent.* This is true in all language and especially in the Bible. Paul said, "That rock *was* [represented]

Christ." "The seven candlesticks are [symbolize] the seven churches." "This is [signifies] the Lord's passover." So likewise, "This is [represents] my body," or "this is [a symbol of] my blood." Such an interpretation is required because a literal one is excluded by the fact that when these words were spoken Jesus was sitting with the disciples at the table in his body. It had been absurd for the disciples to think that the bread and wine he had given to them were his body and blood. Also after its consecration and when eaten the bread is still called bread by Paul. "We are all *partakers* of that one *bread*" (1 Cor. 10:17). "As often as ye *eat* this *bread*" (11:26). The theory of transubstantiation of the elements contradicts the evidence of the senses and any scientific test that can be applied. If we can not trust our senses in distinguishing the nature of the elements, how can we trust our senses of sight and hearing in reading or hearing the words of Christ concerning the Supper. The theory is also objectionable in that it denies the completeness of Christ's past atonement by offering another. This is unscriptural presumption. The theory has no support either in the Scripture or in reason, but only in the authority of the Romish Church.

According to the Lutheran and High Church view, the bread and wine do not cease to be bread and wine at their consecration, but the communicant in partaking of them also partakes of the real and corporeal body and blood of Christ, which, in an inexplainable manner, is *in* and *with* the consecrated bread and wine. This view is known as consubstantiation. It is objectionable because it rests upon the same misinterpretation of Scripture as does the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation. According to Luther, the theory of consubstantiation requires the essential omnipresence of the body of Christ. But if this be true, as Dr. A. H. Strong has well said, "We partake of it at every meal, as really as at the Lord's Supper."

A third erroneous theory of the sense in which Christ is in the Supper is that advanced by Calvin and known as the mystical presence theory. He denied any corporeal presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, but held that his human nature was dynamically present, and that this mystical presence feeds the soul of the communicant. Even though this view denies the corporeal presence of Christ in the elements, yet it rests on the same erroneous literal interpretation of the words,

"This is my body." If these words mean literally it *is* his body, then they do not mean it represents his body. But flesh and blood do not exist in any mystical sense. As already shown the true sense of the words is that the bread and wine represented his body and blood. There is no more a mystical partaking of Christ in the Supper than there is a mystical cleansing of sin in water baptism. As baptism is representative of an inward cleansing, so the eating of the elements of the Lord's Supper is representative of our salvation through appropriating by faith the benefits of Christ's atonement.

III. Foot-Washing

While the washing of one another's feet by Christians, in conformity to the example and injunction of Jesus (John 13: 2-17), has not been so generally regarded as an ordinance as have baptism and the Lord's Supper, yet it has been practised in obedience to that commandment, as a rite, by many throughout the past Christian centuries as well as at the present time. As the mode and purpose of baptism and the Lord's Supper were much perverted at an early date, so was also the practise of foot-washing among Christians. Yet the practise, in obedience to Jesus' commandment, has ever persisted among Christians.

Tertullian, who wrote near the close of the second century, mentions foot-washing as a common practise of the Christians of his time in obedience to the commandment of Jesus. "The post-Apostolic age understood the example thus given [by Jesus] to be mandatory. Augustine (Epist. ad Januarium) testifies that it was followed on Maundy Thursday by the Church of his day" (Shaff-Herzog, Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge). Bernard of Clairvaux recommended foot-washing and regarded it as being a sacrament. Though the practise has been greatly perverted, yet it is still observed both in the Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches, each year on the Thursday preceding Easter, by the higher clergy or other persons of rank. At that time it is practised by the patriarch of Constantinople, the pope, a number of bishops, monastic superiors, and (until recent years) the emperors of Russia and Austria, and the kings of Spain, Portugal, and Bavaria. Each of these washed the feet of twelve old men invited for the purpose or twelve priests. It

was the evident insincerity in the practise on the part of these dignitaries that led Luther to oppose the practise as "that hypocritical foot-washing, in which one stoops to wash the feet of his inferior, but expects still more humility in return." Doubtless such opposition from one so prominent in the early molding of Protestant practises and beliefs has had a great influence in excluding the practise among Protestants.

Yet not a few Protestant bodies have practised it. M'Clintock and Strong say, "The Church of England at first carried out the letter of the command." Until the reign of James II the English kings washed the feet of the poor on Maundy Thursday. The practise of foot-washing in the Church of England has long since fallen into disuse. The Anabaptists were very strongly in favor of foot-washing, regarding it as an ordinance on the ground of John 13:14 and 1 Tim. 5:10. It was also observed by the early Moravians in connection with their love feasts. It is practised as an ordinance at present by the Mennonites, Church of the Brethren, Winebrennarians, many of the smaller Baptist bodies, and the church of God. Therefore, including the older communions the majority of Christians are members of churches which practise foot-washing in some manner.

1. **The Injunction of Jesus.**—The leading text of Scripture bearing on foot-washing among Christians is that found in John 13:2-17. The washing of the disciples' feet by Jesus took place on the occasion of the last Passover supper. The expression "and supper being ended" (v. 2) may better be understood to mean the preparation of the supper being ended, for by comparison of what follows in this chapter with the accounts of the Synoptic Gospels the foot-washing evidently preceded the eating of the supper. Probably there was strife among the disciples as to who should have the places of honor at the table when they began to take their places, which may have been the immediate cause for Jesus' doing what he did. "He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself. After that he poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. Then cometh he to Simon Peter: and Peter saith unto him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet? Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now; but thou

shalt know hereafter. Peter saith unto him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head. Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all. For he knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean. So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them" (John 13:4-17).

The act of Jesus was a literal washing of their feet. He then said, "Know ye what I have done to you?" implying that they did not and therefore going ahead to explain. He told them that as he had washed their feet so they "*ought* to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye *should* do as I have done to you." The words "ought" and "should" imply obligation or duty. That obligation was to wash the feet of one another as he had washed theirs. He washed theirs literally; therefore their duty was literally to wash the feet of one another. An "example" is for imitation, and to imitate his example is literally to wash the feet of one's brother.

Much is made of discriminating between foot-washing as a Christian practise and as an ordinance. That the practise is commanded is clear and Christians are obligated to do it. Probably the question of whether it is to be termed an ordinance is not so important as it has sometimes been assumed to be by those who do not practise it. It is noticeable that those who deny that it is an ordinance usually fail to observe it as a practise and therefore fail to keep a plain commandment. But reasons exist for believing it is an ordinance. It has the criteria of an ordinance, as given by Dr. Harvey in a quotation at the beginning of this chapter. From what may be known from baptism and the Lord's Supper, the marks of an ordinance are: (1)

That it be instituted by divine authority; (2) That it be an outward act practised by Christ; (3) That it be divinely enjoined to be practised by all Christians perpetually; (4) That it represent an important religious truth and the Christian's relation thereto. As surely as these marks are to be found in baptism or the Lord's Supper, they are to be found in the institution of foot-washing.

There can be no doubt that Jesus instituted foot-washing as a Christian practise. Jesus himself practised it in giving an example to his disciples. It is symbolic of the great religious truth that Christians humbly serve one another through love. He also clearly commanded his disciples to wash one another's feet. And what he commanded the first disciples to observe is commanded to all Christians, for he told them to teach others "to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. 28:20). In comparison, neither baptism nor the Lord's Supper has surer marks of being an ordinance than does foot-washing. Jesus himself states that he had washed their feet; his act is described in greater detail than is his baptism or the institution of the Supper; he said it was an example that they should follow; he said they ought to do it; and finally he told them they would be happy if they did do it. No such promise as this is connected with either of the other ordinances.

The teaching concerning foot-washing is so clear, and the injunction to Christians to observe it so definite, that many devout Christians feel obligated to practise it even though their denomination ignores it. Probably the omission of it by so many Protestant bodies is partly due to the influence of Luther, who rejected the literal observance of it because of his objection to the hypocritical practise of the pope in pretending to observe it. The omission of the observance of foot-washing by Protestants has led to many objections on their part to the obligation to observe it. Though these objections are often unworthy of those who make them, yet a consideration of the principal ones is proper at this point.

2. **Objections to Foot-Washing Considered.**—Doubtless the most common objection to foot-washing as a Christian practise is that the washing of feet was an ancient Oriental custom resulting from the wearing of sandals. Evidently there is some similarity between that washing of feet for cleanliness and this washing

which Jesus performed and commanded. Also the common Oriental bathing with which Jesus was familiar was similar to Christian baptism, and the eating of bread and drinking of wine at ordinary meals among the Jews of Jesus' time was similar to the eating of bread and drinking of wine at the Lord's Supper. But in no case was the Christian rite identical with the common custom. If foot-washing is to be rejected on the ground of the Oriental custom, then consistency requires that baptism and the Lord's Supper be rejected also on similar grounds. In reality the old custom of washing feet for cleanliness has no more to do with that feet-washing Jesus practised and commanded in the upper room than the common custom of bathing or eating supper has to do with the other ordinances.

That this which Jesus did was not the common custom is certain from an examination of that custom. Examples of the custom are found in Gen. 18:4; 19:2; 24:32; 43:24; Judg. 19:21; 2 Sam. 11:8. In all of these instances the washing was for cleanliness and comfort and each person washed his own feet. In but one instance (1 Sam. 25:40, 41) is there mention of one washing the feet of another person. Abigail offered to wash the feet of the servants of David. It was an expression of deep humility. Doubtless in some instances the rich and powerful had servants wash their feet as they did also their hands and heads. Peter evidently supposed at first that Jesus was following this custom in washing his disciples' feet and objected on the ground that it was not proper that the master should wash the servant's feet. When Jesus insisted on washing his feet, Peter, still assuming that Jesus was practising the social custom, consistently offered to allow Jesus to wash his hands and head also. But Jesus told him that because he was already bathed, "clean every whit," including his feet, he did not need his hands and head washed, but only his feet. He told Peter that he did not understand what was being done to him; therefore it was not the common custom with which Peter was familiar. But Jesus said, "Thou shalt know hereafter," after the washing was completed. When he had finished washing their feet Jesus sat down and told them the significance of what he had done, and commanded them to wash one another's feet. It was not the common custom of washing for cleanliness. No careful thinker will object to foot-washing as an ordinance on this ground. The

weakness of this objection reminds one of the weakness of the objections to immersion as the true mode of baptism, which are resorted to to uphold an unsound position.

A second objection is that Jesus washed their feet because their feet were dirty, in support of which the latter part of verse eleven is pointed to, "Ye are clean, but not all." It is assumed that the sense in which they were not all clean was that their feet were not clean. Those who so interpret this expression show that they have not carefully read the context. The preceding clause of the sentence plainly states that they were "clean every whit." But the following verse shows positively what is the sense of the words "ye are clean, but not all." "For he knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean." Judas was defiled in heart. Jesus first affirmed that they were "clean every whit" as to their bodies. Then suddenly passing to the question of their moral cleanness, he stated that they were all clean from sin except Judas. Clean feet are not washed for cleanliness. The washing of their feet was for a religious purpose.

A third objection is that this act of Jesus was to teach the disciples humility. Doubtless this is true, according to Jesus' own words at the time. We readily admit this, and affirm that it will serve the same purpose when practised today. If it was needed then to teach disciples their proper relation to one another, it is equally necessary today. Therefore, allowing the objection, if its observance was not positively commanded and if it did not bear the clear marks of an ordinance, its practise would be desirable for the sake of its lesson.

A fourth objection is that it is but an example of all charitable works and therefore the doing of good works is a proper substitute and the thing commanded. Support of this objection is sought in 1 Tim. 5:10, where the qualifications are named for those widows who are to be supported by the benevolences of the church. "If she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work." The objector assumes that because it is here listed as a good work it must therefore not be an ordinance. But both home duties and religious duties are good works. Paul here enumerates examples of both classes. The washing of the saints'

feet is the only one of the ordinances that could be named here which a widow could be obliged to practise. She was not eligible to baptize people, nor to administer the Lord's Supper. But she was duty bound to wash the saints' feet, and if she had not done so was not a worthy object for the church's care.

That the foot-washing of this text is not the common foot-washing of hospitality is clear from the text itself. It does not say, "if she have washed the feet of her children," or "of the strangers she lodged," or "of the afflicted she relieved," but "if she have washed the *saints'* feet." Good deeds are to be done to both saints and sinners indiscriminately. But this foot-washing is to be done to the saints, by one saint to another. This agrees exactly with Jesus' words to his disciples, "Ye also ought to wash *one another's* feet." It is a practise peculiar to Christians; therefore not a social custom. Moreover those whose feet Jesus washed were clean already, and it is not a good work, but a waste of time, to wash clean feet unless it be a religious rite or for another purpose than was the common custom. But as already shown, Jesus performed and commanded the specific act of washing one another's feet, and no substitution of other good deeds constitutes obedience to that commandment.

A fifth objection is that because of our dress and customs being different from those prevalent in Palestine in Jesus' day, foot-washing is undignified and inconvenient. The same argument has equal weight, however, against baptism by immersion. It is much more inconvenient to prepare to be immersed than to prepare to have one's feet washed. And how undignified it is to be plunged under the water and to come out possibly strangling and with one's clothing dripping and disordered. Yet millions who omit foot-washing strongly support immersion. But dignity is determined altogether by one's education and viewpoint. Certainly the sexes should separate themselves from one another for the observance of the rite of foot-washing, but when this is done the practise is not open to the charge of either impropriety or a lack of Christian dignity. And as to inconvenience, no more time is required to arrange for observing this ordinance than for the Lord's Supper or baptism. But if it were especially inconvenient, there is no ground for assuming that God consulted men's convenience when instituting the ordinances.

A sixth objection is that most of the New Testament writers make no mention of foot-washing. In reply we say, if it is clearly set forth in but one place the obligation to observe it is as binding as if it were mentioned often. It is described at length and definitely enjoined in John's Gospel. The Synoptic Gospels make no mention of Jesus' washing his disciples' feet. But neither do they say anything of Jesus' teaching concerning the new birth. If the absence of mention of foot-washing by them is reason for rejecting foot-washing, it logically follows that the teaching of regeneration must be rejected for the same reason. Foot-washing is not mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, but the Lord's Supper is clearly referred to only once (Acts 20:7), and that mention is but incidental. In all the twenty-one epistles foot-washing is mentioned only in 1 Tim. 5:10, but in all those epistles the Lord's Supper is also mentioned but once (1 Cor. 11). It would doubtless not have been mentioned there except for the wrong observance of it which Paul sought to correct. Had there been a similar perversion of the observance of foot-washing, we may well suppose it would have been likewise mentioned. The Scriptures do not set forth doctrine formally, but rather incidentally. This ordinance is mentioned in the first epistle to Timothy because there was occasion for referring to it. Had there been other occasions there would have been other mention of it.

3. **Significance of Foot-Washing.**—As is true of the other ordinances, this rite has a purpose. Like them it is designed to teach a spiritual truth. It instructs by means of an object lesson. We may say of this as Augustine said of the other ordinances, "It is a kind of visible word." In this it bears an intimate relation to the preaching of the Word of God. As was true of the Lord's Supper, the significance of this rite was made known when it was instituted. "Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. . . . The servant is not greater than his Lord" (John 13:13-16). It teaches the important lesson of humility; that we are not to seek to be served, but to serve our brethren. It signifies our true relation to each other—at our brethren's feet as their servant. The humility and service here represented are possible only by love. And love is the greatest of all virtues.

God is love. This then is worthy to be represented by a Christian ordinance as are the great truths represented by the other ordinances. Each of the three ordinances illustrates an important relationship. Baptism shows we are dead to the *world*. The communion supper shows our relation to Christ as our Savior. Foot-washing shows our relationship as servants of each other.

PART VII

LAST THINGS, OR ESCHATOLOGY

PART VII

LAST THINGS, OR ESCHATOLOGY

From the Greek term meaning "last" comes the name eschatology which is given to that division of theology that treats concerning the intermediate state, the second coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the final judgment, the end of the world, the future punishment of the wicked, and the future blessedness of the righteous. The subjects here to be considered are important because only on the ground of their reality do the subjects previously discussed have any special concern for us.

Chapter I

THE LIFE AFTER DEATH

I. Immortality of the Soul

The subject of immortality, though not directly belonging to the doctrine of last things, yet underlies that doctrine, and it is important that it be proved at this point. It has already received some consideration, but more complete proofs are now desirable. These proofs are of two main classes—rational and Scriptural.

1. **Rational Evidences.**—If there be no substance but matter, and if mental operations be dependent upon the organized matter of the brain, then when the physical body, including the brain, dies and is disorganized the mind ceases to be and conscious existence ends. But if spirit and body are distinct substances, the latter may be dissolved without necessarily affecting the conscious existence of the former. That spirit and body are two distinct substances, entirely different in their nature, has been sufficiently shown in a previous division. But though the distinction between mind and matter as to their essential nature is necessary to the survival of the spirit after the death of the body, yet this distinction does not necessarily require that the spirit be immortal. There can be no immortality apart from such a distinction, but the mortality of the mind at the time of the dissolution of the body is conceivable. If the fact that the mind is an immaterial, simple substance were proof of

its immortal conscious existence, as some have reasoned, then the argument might seem to prove the immortality of the immaterial principle in brutes as well as in men.

(1) *Sense of Moral Obligation Looks to the Future.* As man intuitively recognizes himself as under moral obligation, so he intuitively believes in a life beyond this life. The fact of moral responsibility implies immortality. Every normal man, whether good or bad, believes he shall be rewarded if he does that which is good and shall be punished if he does that which is evil. This is implied in the feeling of moral obligation. The moral nature of man looks to the future in this respect. But it is evident, even to the casual observer, that men are not rewarded or punished according to their deserts in this life. The righteous man struggles stedfastly against temptation to evil, he unselfishly sacrifices personal advantage for the happiness of his fellow men, and because of supreme love for God he lives for the Divine glory, yet not infrequently throughout life he suffers from disease and poverty, is persecuted for righteousness' sake, and possibly dies the death of a martyr. He does not receive the reward in this life his goodness deserves. Shall he not receive it in a future existence? Justice and reason unite in affirming that there is a future life where he will be properly rewarded.

Likewise the wicked man sometimes sins and prospers. While he blasphemes God and oppresses his helpless neighbor he spreads himself like the green bay-tree, and closes his earthly life in peace while committing atrocious crimes. He does not receive his just punishment here. Men naturally expect he will receive it in a future life. If there were no life after death wherein the good man shall be rewarded and the bad man punished, reason would require that there ought to be.

(2) *Inferred from the Soul's Powers.* The human soul has capacities for indefinite improvement. Every man has powers that are never developed. Most men feel they are capable of attainments far beyond what their time and opportunities ever enable them to realize in the limits of this life. A large portion of the race die in infancy with their soul's powers almost wholly undeveloped. Often even the greatest men believe themselves to be possessed of abilities many times greater than they have developed. It is reasonable to believe that infinite wisdom in creating these powers capable of unlimited increase has pro-

vided opportunity for such advancement in an unlimited existence beyond this life, inasmuch as the present life affords no such opportunity.

(3) *Earthly Life Alone Not a Satisfaction.* If it were true that our earthly life is the full measure of our existence we might well inquire, "What advantageth it me?" For most men life would be without any real advantage if conscious existence forever ends with death. Yet doubtless this life, whatever be one's condition, is a blessing and something desirable. But we affirm that it is esteemed to be such because of what is believed to be beyond it. For most persons this life alone has so large a measure of trouble and sorrow intermixed with its joys that the words of the Preacher may well be appropriated to describe it: "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." If this short earthly life be bounded by two eternities of non-entity, if in a few short years we shall cease to be forever, then what advantage is present existence? In such a case, whatever blessing this life may bring it is not a satisfaction. The blessings of life are estimated in view of immortality. As men always estimate the advantage of material wealth, not according to the pleasure it brings at the present, but according to the advantage they expect to derive from it at a future period of this life, so the best things of the earthly life are thought of in relation to their worth to us beyond this life. If there were no future existence, life would be indeed an enigma.

(4) *Universality of the Belief.* Men everywhere and in all ages have been believers in a future life, though that belief has sometimes been obscure. The belief has been as universal as religion, and religion is common to all nations. Only in philosophic speculation has man's immortality been questioned. The universality and persistence of this idea is to be accounted for only on the ground that such belief is natural to man. The universality of this belief, like that of the idea of the existence of God or of moral obligation, is best explained on the ground that it is an intuition of man's nature.

It is sometimes said that men expect a future life because of their desire for it. Doubtless such a desire for continued existence is common to men. But that this desire is not that which leads men to expect a future life is evident from the fact that wicked men who expect future punishment do not desire con-

tinued existence after death. Also the righteous, like Paul, sometimes expect and desire the future life without caring for the earthly life. A more reasonable view is that men's instinctive desire for a future life is divinely implanted and that God implanted it in man's nature because, as is true of all other divinely implanted desires, he has made provisions for its gratification. The witness of man's nature in this respect is the testimony of Him who made the nature.

In addition to the foregoing arguments is the value of belief in immortality. This alone is ground for holding it to be truth. Faith in a future life leads men to perform noble deeds, and to live good lives. The truth of immortality is that which gives meaning to the great truth of salvation through Christ.

2. **The Teaching of Scripture.**—Though Christians appreciate the value of rational evidences of immortality, yet they are not dependent upon them for ground for their faith in this truth, but find the surest and fullest proof of the doctrine in the Scriptures. Immortality, like many other truths, is more clearly revealed in the New Testament, but it is by no means absent from the Old, as has been sometimes erroneously affirmed. But few texts of Scripture directly affirm the immortality of the soul, yet it is clearly implied throughout the Bible. It is implied in the idea of reward for goodness and punishment for sin, and especially in the idea of salvation from punishment hereafter. These truths are ever present in the Scriptures. But for a more definite exhibition of the teaching of the Scriptures a few texts which affirm or imply the continued conscious existence of the spirit after death are here cited. Proofs of the survival of the spirit after the dissolution of the body are to most men sufficient evidence of immortality.

When the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection, came to Jesus with a question relating thereto, Jesus answered them with an argument based on the words of God to Moses at the burning bush, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living" (Matt. 22:32). From the present tense in this Old Testament text Jesus reasoned that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were still alive, though their bodies had been buried for hundreds of years in the cave of Machpelah. At one stroke Jesus not only refuted the error of the Sadducees concerning the resurrection,

but did so by showing the fallacy of their more fundamental error in denying that the soul still lives when the body dies. The reasoning of Jesus can not be mistaken. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. After the death of their bodies God was still the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Therefore they were still living. But as their bodies were not living it must be that their souls were living. Jesus' reasoning was sound. But not only did the souls of these patriarchs live after their bodies died, for on the same occasion Jesus said, "For *all* live unto him" (Luke 20:38). The souls of all men are immortal.

Jesus also taught the immortality of the soul in his account of the rich man and Lazarus. "And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom" (Luke 16:22, 23). Here both Lazarus and the rich man died. Immediately after death the former is said to have been comforted and the latter is represented as having been tormented, which certainly implies that both were conscious. The rich man could also speak and remember. This is represented as having taken place in the world of departed spirits. It can not refer to their condition beyond the judgment and after the resurrection, because the five brothers of the rich man were still living on earth and in danger of going to that place. It is a matter of little difference whether this account be regarded as a real history or a parable. In either case its doctrinal teaching is the same. It would be as impious to charge Christ with so misrepresenting the truth in his parables as to mislead men, as to say he did not faithfully represent the truth in his literal teaching. This account in any case clearly teaches that men's souls continue to live after death.

The words of Jesus to the dying thief also clearly teach that the soul continues to live after death. "Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise" (Luke 23:43.) The body of the thief, like that of Jesus, died on the cross and was buried. It was their spirits which went to paradise. The very idea of being in paradise implies a state of felicity and therefore of conscious existence. And that state was to be entered, not thousands of years later as soul-sleepers

and annihilationists affirm, but the very day on which they died —"today."

In their efforts otherwise to explain this text, annihilationists tell us the term "today" is used to qualify "say" and not "shalt be." They affirm that the comma should be placed after, not before, the word "today." Then it is interpreted that the thief would be with Jesus in paradise after the resurrection and Jesus' assertion is merely that he affirmed it on that day—as if the thief might suppose he was speaking on the day before or the day after that on which he was speaking! To justify such change of the punctuation, it is said that the original record had no punctuation and that the placing of the comma is a modern invention. Doubtless the original had no comma, but it had a meaning, and that meaning was not absurd. Faithful translation into English requires such a placing of punctuation marks, where they are used, as will bring out that meaning. The text clearly teaches that the penitent thief was to enjoy conscious blessedness in another world on the very day his body died. This leaves no room for the theories of a soul-sleep nor of annihilationism.

Paul also believed and taught the doctrine of immortality of the soul. "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and willing to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord" (2 Cor. 5:6-8). Here the Apostle represents the soul as absent from the body. This separation evidently takes place at death. But he says that when he, his soul, is absent from the body, it is present with the Lord, which certainly implies that it has not ceased to exist, as annihilationists affirm. Therefore the souls of the dead have continued uninterrupted existence after death. Also the Apostle desired to be absent from the body that he might be present with the Lord. It is not conceivable that such a man as Paul should have desired a soul-sleep or unconsciousness rather than the life of "rejoicing always" which he lived. Therefore the souls of the righteous after death have conscious existence. This text also is fatal to the theories of soul-sleeping and annihilationism.

Again Paul says, "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain . . . . For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to

depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you" (Phil. 1:21, 23, 24). Existence is always preferable to non-existence. This is especially true of a joyful existence. In this same epistle the Apostle says, "I rejoice"; and again and again he exhorted the Philippians to rejoice. It has been termed the "rejoicing epistle." Life was no burden to Paul, but he did desire to be with his Lord rather than "to abide in the flesh." To be with the Lord, however, does not mean annihilation, but existence, and that existence with Christ to be preferable to Paul's earthly life must necessarily have been conscious existence. Here again is the divine testimony against the theory of soul-sleeping and annihilation.

Other texts might be cited from both the Old and New Testaments. That the doctrine of immortality of the soul is taught in the Old Testament is shown by the first text we cited on the subject, in which Jesus appeals to the Old Testament in confuting the Sadducees. The ancient men of faith "confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth" (Heb. 11:13; Gen. 47:9). It is unreasonable to suppose the Hebrews, whose first business was religion, who were God's chosen people, the bearers of true religion, and who were possessed of the divine revelation, should have been without the doctrine of immortality, while all other nations devoid of these advantages without exception held the doctrine. When Jesus came, the worldly sect of the Sadducees were the only ones among the Jews who denied the doctrine. The Pharisees and Essenes strongly affirmed it. Doubtless, however, Jesus "brought life and immortality to light" in the sense that he set the doctrine in a clearer light than was true of it before his coming.

3. **Theory of Conditional Immortality.**—This theory is entirely distinct from that of annihilation of the entire man with the dissolution of the body as held by materialists and from the theory that the soul continues to exist after death, but is in a state of unconscious slumber until the resurrection of the body. The positive proofs of the continued conscious existence of the soul after death sufficiently refute these theories. The theory of conditional immortality affirms that only the souls of Christians are immortal and that the unconverted die utterly with the death of their bodies. It is said that immortality is lost

through sin and recovered only by faith in Christ. According to this theory the sinner absolutely ceases to exist at death, as is held by the materialistic theory of annihilation. Those who hold conditional immortality usually profess to hold it on Biblical grounds and in order to allow for a general judgment they affirm that the wicked will be brought again into being to be judged and again annihilated.

This theory is held as a result of a misapprehension of the sense of certain texts of Scripture which represent the sinner as spiritually dead and the righteous as having spiritual or eternal life. The theory assumes that life always means merely existence and that death means always a cessation of existence. Examples of the texts used to support this theory are the following: "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3:15). "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life" (John 3:36). "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life" (John 10:27, 28). "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 6:23). "God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son" (1 John 5:11).

For a proper interpretation of these and other texts used to support the theory of conditional immortality it is important first to determine the sense of the terms "eternal life," "everlasting life," and "death." If the two former expressions always meant endless existence merely, and the latter merely cessation of existence, then they would furnish support for the theory. But they include more than these, as is evident from both the Scriptures and reason. To confound the experience of spiritual life with endless existence or spiritual death with cessation of the soul's existence, is to fail to distinguish between a condition of the soul and its nature. Natural life is a state in which the soul is united with the body. Spiritual life is a state in which the soul is united with God, which is its normal sphere and necessary to its happiness. If one continues in holiness, that happy condition is endless. Natural death consists in the separation of the soul and body. Spiritual death is the separation of the soul from God.

That this is true is evident from Rom. 7:9, where Paul says, "Sin revived and I died." The consequences of sin were certain-

ly not physical death, as Paul's body did not die. He died spiritually, but his soul, or spirit, did not cease to exist nor to be conscious. The spirits of all sinners in this life are as truly conscious as are those of the righteous, and are equal in their natural powers to those of the righteous. They retain their moral and religious natures. This is evident from the functioning of their consciences in a measure and their sense of obligation to love and serve God. But the sinner is spiritually dead in that his sins have separated him from God and he is therefore out of his normal sphere. As spiritual death is separation from God, so spiritual life is union with God. Though eternal life includes endless existence, yet the primary sense of it is union with God.

That immortality is not conditional on one's being righteous is evident from Jesus' teaching that the souls of both the righteous and wicked continue in conscious existence after death, as is clear in the case of the rich man and Lazarus. Also the wicked are punished without end after the judgment. That this is not annihilation will be shown later. The Bible furnishes no ground for the idea that when the child reaches the age of moral responsibility and sins his soul ceases to exist; yet this must be true if spiritual death is what this theory assumes it to be. The theory is, not only unscriptural, but also unreasonable. Reason alone furnishes ample proof that the sinner, who is in the state of spiritual death, has a living soul with all the natural powers belonging to it.

II. The Intermediate State

The fact of the continued existence of the soul after death and the truth of the resurrection of the body and the reuniting of the soul with it imply an intermediate state. Between the close of the present life and the beginning of the final state the spirit is in a condition different from that of this life or that beyond the resurrection. Though it has conscious existence it is disembodied. Whether it is blessed or punished and regardless of where these disembodied souls abide, the fact of an intermediate state is certain.

1. **Question of an Intermediate Place.**—An intermediate *state,* or condition of the dead, does not necessarily imply an intermediate *place* between earth and the places of final destiny. On the question of an intermediate *place* two main views are held

among Christians. One view is that at death the disembodied souls of the righteous and wicked go directly to the places of everlasting blessedness and of torment respectively. The other view is that they do not go at once to the places of final destiny, heaven and hell (γέ-εννα [gehenna]), but await the day of judgment in an intermediate place called Hades, one part of which is designated Paradise or Abraham's bosom and is a place of happiness for the righteous; the other part being called hell, or lower Hades, and sometimes Tartarus, and is a place of punishment. The question of an intermediate place of itself has little practical value for Christian thought, but is chiefly of speculative interest. However, men's natural interest in the place of their future abode has led them to hold radically different views. With the exception of the Church of England, the leading Protestant bodies disallow the theory of an intermediate place.

2. **Not a State of Purgatory.**—The intermediate state is not one of purgatorial suffering for sin. The Romish doctrine of purgatory assumes that when members of the Roman Catholic Church who are not perfect, but only guilty of venial sins, die, their souls pass into a place called purgatory, where they suffer for the purpose of expiation and also for purification from the defilement of those sins. According to the traditional doctrine, this suffering is from literal fire and is in intensity and duration proportionate to one's sinfulness. When one has suffered sufficiently for this expiation and purging he passes on to heaven. He may remain in purgatory for a few hours or for thousands of years. In consistency with the Romish principle of the power of the keys it is assumed that the priest has power to remit the penalty for sins and release souls from purgatory. It is affirmed that the sufferings of purgatory may be alleviated or their duration shortened by the prayers of the saints and especially by the sacrifice of the mass.

The doctrine of purgatory is in strict harmony with other Romish principles. According to these, the atonement of Christ is efficacious in saving from eternal death only. For all one's postbaptismal sins satisfaction must be made by the sinner by good works and penance, and one may enter heaven only when such satisfaction is made. If it is not accomplished in this life it must be effected after death. This is the ground for the

doctrine of purgatory. But the eucharist is held to be a sacrificing of Christ anew for sin by way of atonement as was his death on the cross. This is assumed to be efficacious for the pardon of sins committed after baptism, and to secure the forgiveness of those for whom the priest offers it. On this ground it is said that the priest has power to deliver souls from the sufferings of purgatory.

Romanists do not usually attempt to support the doctrine of purgatory on Scriptural grounds, but rather on the authority of the church and especially the views expressed by some of the Church Fathers concerning purification by fire, and expiation by sufferings after death. To whatever extent these may have held such views they evidently did not receive them from the Scriptures, but probably from the Grecian philosophers, especially Plato, who boldly advocated the idea of purification by fire. The Romish doctrine is objectionable, not only because it fails of Scriptural support, but especially because it contradicts the Bible. It denies that the atonement of Christ is sufficient to save from all sin, and that salvation is only by the grace of God through Christ. Such denial is clearly contrary to Scripture. We are not saved by our own sufferings, for Christ suffered in our stead. The whole system of doctrine which leads up to, and provides the ground for, the doctrine of purgatory is wrong. The souls of dead believers spend no part of the intermediate period in purgatorial suffering for sin.

3. **Not a State of Probation.**—That disembodied souls are not in a state of probation between death and the judgment is a clear implication of the Scriptures. If they were given opportunity for salvation after death, then those texts are meaningless which urge the importance of our being saved now and which warn of awful doom if the present offer of mercy is not accepted. The Scriptures are replete with warnings against such neglect. "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" (Heb. 2:1-3). "He that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:16). "Whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already" (v. 18). "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life" (v. 36). "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in

his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad'' (2 Cor. 5:10). ''For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law'' (Rom. 2:12).

These and many other texts state or imply that repentance, faith, and obedience in this life are the ground for future reward or punishment. We are represented as the subjects of reward or punishment only for our deeds in this life. If our probation continued throughout the intermediate state, then the deeds of that state being much more numerous for the large majority of the race, and therefore for them far more important, ought rather to be made the principal ground for our final retribution than the deeds of this life. But the Scriptures are absolutely silent about a probation after death. This silence in such a connection is of itself ground for saying there is no such opportunity of salvation hereafter. In Jesus' discourse concerning the rich man and Lazarus, he represents the good and the wicked as separated by an impassable gulf. No hint is given of the possibility of its ever being passed over.

One text especially has been depended upon as implying a probation after death. ''For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water'' (1 Pet. 3:18-20). This text is assumed by some to teach that Jesus' disembodied spirit went to hades while his body lay in the tomb, that he preached the gospel in hades in order that souls there who had been impenitent during their earthly life might be afforded an opportunity to be saved, and that therefore all those who die in sin will be given an opportunity to be saved after death. This is all gratuitous assumption. Before this text can properly be understood to teach a second probation it must be shown: (1) that Christ preached to these spirits after they were disembodied rather than during their earthly life; (2) that the ''prison'' is hades; (3) that the preaching consisted in an offer of pardon; (4) that he offered salvation to any other than to these antediluvians, specifically mentioned; and (5) that if he did he will therefore give a like opportunity of salvation to

all who die impenitent. Evidently this text is no proof that the intermediate state is a probationary condition.

The true meaning of this text must be admitted to be obscure. We may be certain it does not support a second probation, but probably the true interpretation is too uncertain to admit of dogmatism. Two principal views are held concerning it. According to one view the latter part of verse eighteen should read, "quickened *in* the spirit." Then it was Jesus' personal disembodied spirit which went to hades and there proclaimed the fact of his atonement for sin to the unbelieving antediluvians who died in rejection of God's message. As held by many this view does not imply that another chance of salvation was offered to those to whom the preaching of Jesus was directed, nor that such preaching is heard by all men. This interpretation is confronted by various difficulties. (1) Because a second probation is inadmissible, this proclaiming of the accomplishment of his atonement by Jesus has no apparent purpose, but is a useless proclaiming. (2) This interpretation has no support in any other place in the Scriptures, but is rather contradictory to their general tenor. (3) Jesus did not go to the place of wicked spirits when he died, but to paradise or heaven.

The other view, which seems to avoid these difficulties and is more acceptable to many, is that either by the Holy Spirit, if the rendering of the common version be followed, or by his own personal spirit, the Logos, according to the Revised Version, Christ preached to the antediluvians through Noah while the ark was being constructed. The preaching was done before they died, but they were dead when Peter wrote of it (1 Pet. 4:6). Their being in prison may be understood as meaning either that they were imprisoned in Hades when Peter wrote or that they were bound by sin, in the prison of sin, when the preaching was done. Such an interpretation has been ably advocated by Dr. Adam Clarke in his Commentary (unrevised edition). It seems to meet with fewer difficulties than the interpretation first given. It does not contradict any other statement of the Bible.

CHAPTER II

MILLENARIANISM

The term "millennium" is used in theology to designate a supposed future period of universal righteousness during which Christ will reign on the earth. In duration this period is supposed to be one thousand years, on the ground of Rev. 20:1-6, and therefore the theory is called millenarianism, from the Latin, or chiliasm, from the Greek, both of which have reference to one thousand.

I. Two Theories Distinguished

Two opposing theories are prevalent concerning the millennium—postmillenial and premillenial. They are so designated in relation to the second coming of Christ. The first holds that his advent will be postmillenial, or after the millennium; the other supposes his coming will be premillenial, or will precede the millennium. According to the first view, the converting of the world is the cause of, or at least it prepares the way for, the advent of Christ; and according to the other view, the coming of Christ is the cause of the conversion of the world.

1. **Postmillenarianism.**—Postmillenarians hold that the kingdom of Christ was established at his first advent, that through existing agencies—especially the preaching of the gospel and the operation of the Holy Spirit—world-wide righteousness will be effected. This condition will continue for a long period, but its duration is not necessarily an exact thousand years, nor do its advocates all pretend to hold the theory on the ground of the twentieth chapter of Revelation. During this period Satan is supposed to be restrained, but at its close he will be loosed for a short period, after which Christ will come to raise the dead, judge the world, and destroy the earth.

2. **Premillenarianism.**—Premillenarians hold that the kingdom of Christ does not yet exist, but that it will be established at his second advent. They affirm that present agencies will fail to convert the world, and that wickedness will increase until Christ comes, when it will be supernaturally suppressed. Great diversity of views exists among advocates of the premillennial coming of Christ as to events and the order of their occurrence.

Only by consulting a particular teacher of the theory may

New Testament. The apostles taught a present spiritual kingdom of Christ.

2. **Millenarianism in the Early Church.**—Though the teaching of Jesus and of the apostles was not millenarian, yet the theory found much support among Christians in the second century and early part of the third. Of the early church fathers it was held by Barnabas, Papias, Justin Martyr, Ireneus, and Tertullian. The millennial views of these fathers were identical with those held by the Jews, except that they were given a Christian setting. It is not difficult to understand how millenarianism found entrance to Christian thought. The first Christians were Jews. They had been accustomed to anticipations of millennial glories in connection with the Messiah's reign. When they accepted Jesus as that Messiah and yet found their dreams unrealized, they very naturally transferred those millennial glories in their thinking from the first to the second advent of Christ. They found the New Testament teachings concerning Christ's coming again in glory and the resurrection of the dead not difficult to harmonize with their millennial hopes.

Papias, whose views were shared by Ireneus, assumed there would be wonderful material benefits in the millennial age. Ireneus wrote, "The days will come in which the vines shall grow, each having ten thousand branches, and in each branch ten thousand twigs, and in each true twig ten thousand shoots, and in each one of the shoots ten thousand clusters, and on every one of the clusters ten thousand grapes, and every grape when pressed will give five and twenty metretes of wine" (about two hundred and twenty-five gallons from each grape).

But though some eminent fathers held millenarianism, it was never generally accepted. Montanism, which gave much prominence to millenarianism, was condemned by different synods of Asia Minor as heresy about 160 A. D. Dr. C. A. Briggs says of chiliasm, "The mass of writers as well as churches, speaking through their local assemblies, bishops, and patriarchs either show an entirely different conception of eschatology, or else, as in the great churches of Rome, Alexandria, and Asia Minor, they condemned the heresy; so that before the First Ecumenical Council of Nice, chiliasm had been suppressed in all parts of the Christian Church." That it was not generally accepted from an early date is evident from the fact that

millenarianism, to which this chapter is principally devoted. The following criticism of this theory is to be understood as directed wholly against its principles and not against its advocates, many of whom are doubtless earnest and devout Christians.

II. History of Millenarianism

1. **The Idea Among the Jews.**—Christians originally borrowed the idea of a millennium from the Jews, but in its widest sense the idea was not original with the Jews. Various heathen nations—Egypt, Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome—had an idea of a future golden age of the world when evil would be suppressed. Zoroastrianism expected a thousand-year period to follow the downfall of hostile powers, which period was connected with a resurrection of the dead. The later Jewish conception of such a period would naturally be colored by these views of a similar period held by the nations about them. The Jewish conception, however, was based principally upon the Messianic predictions of the Old Testament. There the Messiah was represented as executing judgment upon the enemies of Israel, as reestablishing the throne of David at Jerusalem in great splendor, as exalting Israel, and as ruling over the Gentiles. Then the wilderness would blossom as the rose, the soil would be very fertile and nature especially prolific, while wild beasts would become docile, and wars would cease among men.

Because of a literal interpretation of these prophecies, the Jews generally expected the Messiah to establish an earthly kingdom. Such was the common expectation of the Jews of the time of Christ. Even the apostles held such a view only a short time prior to Jesus' ascension, in spite of the fact that he had taught again and again that the kingdom is not of this world. The rabbinical writers held some very exaggerated notions of the material benefits of the reign of the Messiah. The earth was to yield many thousandfold, and grain, fruit, and flesh were to be provided in immeasurable abundance.

But Jesus disappointed those carnal hopes. He neither established nor promised to establish such an earthly kingdom. In the words of the New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, "The teaching of Christ is not millenarian." As much may be truly said of the teachings of the epistles of the

nify that, "*In the days of these kings* shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever" (v. 44). But four kingdoms are mentioned in this chapter, the last of which was the Roman. Not later than the time of the Roman Empire was the kingdom of God to be set up. But the Roman Empire has long since passed away. Therefore, the kingdom of God has evidently already been established.

But those who expect the establishment of the divine kingdom in the future, especially premillenarians, assume that "these kings" (v. 44) are the ten minor kingdoms which grew out of the Roman Empire, that these are still in existence, and that therefore the divine kingdom has not yet been established. They suppose the toes of the image represent these minor kingdoms as do the ten horns of the fourth beast described in Daniel 7. But this is not so stated. Moreover, the claim that these toes were intended to represent ten kingdoms is wholly gratuitous. In the expression "these kings" (v. 44) "these" must have for its antecedent the kings already mentioned. No ten minor kingdoms are mentioned; therefore it must refer to those which are mentioned. As already shown, it clearly predicts the setting up of the kingdom of God in the days of the Roman Empire.

Also it was not only the feet that were broken to pieces by the little stone, but "then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors" (Dan. 2:35). But how could those former kingdoms be destroyed by the kingdom of God in the days of the feet or the latter part of the Roman Empire? Certainly, as political powers they had long since ceased to be. Also the destruction of civil governments is not the divine purpose, for God has ordained them. But false religion is a proper subject of Scripture prophecy, and the kingdom of God in its very nature is designed to destroy them. Those ancient world empires were more than political powers. They were upholders of heathen religions. While the political power of those empires preceding the Roman had vanished, the false religion they supported was all included in the Roman Empire. Therefore when the little stone destroyed the pagan-

ism of Rome the same false religion of the preceding governments was overthrown.

In Isa. 9:6, 7 is a prediction of the coming of Christ. A child was to be born. This is clearly a prediction of the first coming of Christ. He was to be the "Prince of peace" and to rule on the "throne of David." As David ruled over Israel, God's people anciently, so does Christ rule over Christians, who are God's people now. There is no hint in this prediction that the rule of Christ is to take place at any other time than at the first advent when the child was born. It is a prediction concerning the first advent. Luke 1:32, 33 concerning Christ sitting on David's throne is to be similarly understood.

3. **Christ's Kingdom Established at His First Advent.**—In the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist and of Jesus they proclaimed "the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 3:2; Mark 1:14, 15). It had been promised from the time of Isaiah seven hundred years before. When Jesus came it ceased to be in the future and had arrived—it was "at hand." If after only seven hundred years of waiting it could be said to be at hand, that proclamation could not possibly mean it would not be established for yet nineteen hundred years or more. If the words "the kingdom of heaven is at hand" do not mean it was established at the first advent of Christ, then the words are misleading.

Jesus often spoke of the kingdom as then existing. "From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force" (Matt. 11:12). "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it" (Luke 16:16). Both of these verses clearly imply the existence of the kingdom. That men were in the kingdom implies its existence. The foregoing and other texts state some were in it. "Who . . . hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son" (Col. 1:13). "I John, who also am your brother . . . in the kingdom . . . of Jesus Christ" (Rev. 1:9). The implication is clear in these verses that the time of the setting up of the kingdom is not in the future.

The kingdom of God came in the days of the apostles. When speaking to them Jesus said, "There be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste death, till they have seen the king-

ing with "kingdom of God" and "kingdom of heaven." As it is used in the New Testament it means the spiritual kingdom of God, as distinguished from God's rule over the universe or the kingdom of literal Israel. The kingdom of God, as to its subjects, is identical with the church. It is the rule of God in the hearts of his people. The question of the kingdom of Christ, especially the nature and time of the establishment of the kingdom, is determinative of the Scripturalness of premillenarianism. That theory rests on the assumption that the kingdom is an earthly, material kingdom, and that its establishment is yet future and to take place at the second advent. If it can be shown that the kingdom of God is a spiritual, not a literal, kingdom, and that it is already in existence, having been established at the first coming of Christ, then the theory of premillenarianism is disproved, not only in these two particulars, but also in all its other aspects, which have these for their basis.

1. **Nature of Christ's Kingdom.**—Jesus said to Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence" (John 18:36). This is a clear statement as to what the kingdom of Christ is not. It is not a political and materialistic kingdom with certain geographical territory and which needs to be upheld by the power of human arms and war. Jesus acknowledges by using the present tense "is" that he has a kingdom, but it is a heavenly, spiritual kingdom.

The Jews expected the Messiah to set up a material, earthly kingdom. It was with that in mind that the Pharisees came to inquire of Jesus. "And being asked by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you" (Luke 17:20, 21, A. S. V.). Jesus here clearly teaches that his kingdom is not of such a nature that it may be seen outwardly, but is spiritual in its nature. It already existed, as is evident from his use of the present tense, but it is within men's hearts and does not consist in material things. Here Jesus specifically sought to correct the misconception of these inquirers that the Messianic kingdom was a literal one. How strange that men today contradict his plain statement by affirming that his king-

dom is materialistic in its nature! Paul also taught likewise against the idea of a material kingdom. "The kingdom is not meat and drink; but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. 14:17).

The kingdom which Christ preached was of such a nature that it instead of material benefits might be sought in the age when he lived (Matt. 6:33). Its nature was such that men might voluntarily enter it at that time. "Every man presseth into it" (Luke 16:16). Admission to it was by means of the new birth. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom" (John 3:5). Evidently a spiritual birth can not induct one into a literal kingdom. During Jesus' day men did enter the kingdom. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye *them that are entering* to go in" (Matt. 23:13). These words would be meaningless if applied to a future earthly kingdom. The teachings of the parables of Jesus to which the kingdom of heaven is likened are incongruous with the idea of an earthly kingdom.

2. **Predictions of the Time of Its Establishment.**—The time of establishment of the kingdom is clearly predicted in the second chapter of Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar had a dream in which he saw a great image with a head of gold, breast and arms of silver, belly and thighs of brass, and legs of iron, and feet part of iron and part of clay. A stone "cut out of the mountains without hands" struck the image on the feet and broke, not only them, but the entire image to pieces. In interpreting the dream Daniel said to Nebuchadnezzar, "Thou, O king, . . . art this head of gold" (Dan. 2:37). But the context shows clearly that not merely Nebuchadnezzar himself was the head of gold, but rather the Chaldean Empire, of which he was the first ruler. "And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth" (v. 39). The two world empires immediately following the Chaldean, were the Medo-Persian, and the Grecian. "And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron" (v. 40). The fourth universal empire counting from the Chaldean was the Roman, which is well described as being strong as iron.

Daniel explained the breaking of the image by the stone to sig-

texts. For example, Jesus said of the communion bread at the last supper, "This is my body" (Matt. 26:26). No literal interpretation nor hint that they are to be literally understood is given of these words in the Bible. According to the principle which premillenarians profess to observe, it inevitably leads to transubstantiation or consubstantiation. Catholics and Lutherans improperly so interpret these words, and profess to be greatly scandalized by a spiritual interpretation of them, much as do premillenarians when their favorite texts are interpreted figuratively. Yet these same premillenarians usually depart from their principle of literal interpretation when they come to interpret the words, "This is my body." Doubtless the Bible does not always literally "mean what it says." It rather means what it signifies.

A chapter on "Literal Interpretation" is given by W. E. Blackstone in his book "Jesus Is Coming," in which he gives a list of several prophecies of Christ's first coming which were literally fulfilled. He then gives another list of predictions which he assumes teach premillenarianism and reasons that because the prophecies of the first list were literally fulfilled therefore the prophecies of the second list shall be literally fulfilled. But this is the same as to reason that because some parts of Scripture are to be understood literally therefore all parts must be so interpreted. Such a conclusion would contradict the examples of symbols in the Bible already pointed out. Though his reasoning is unsound at this point, it is not more so than at many other places. He further attempts to support his theory of literal interpretation by quoting a child as saying, "If Jesus did not mean what he said, why did he not say what he meant." Such reasoning is worthy only of a child, but one wonders that this writer who is looked to as a leading representative of the theory he advocates would resort to it. Jesus and the inspired writers *did* say what they meant. But they sometimes used figures and symbols to express their thoughts more forcefully, as do all men at times. Such childish reasoning would deny the existence of any figurative language in the Bible, which even Blackstone admits exists in some instances.

2. **Historical Interpretation.**—Scripture must be interpreted in the light of its context, the purpose of the particular writing, the viewpoint of its writer, the time when he wrote, and the

condition of those to whom he wrote. Each of the inspired writers wrote his message for a practical purpose to certain men living in his day. To understand any text of Scripture we must know its proper historical setting. To interpret the Bible as if all parts are on the same level in that they were originally addressed to us by writers who had our time and circumstances in mind is to go far astray. Particular verses can not properly be employed in support of a doctrine except as their context and historical setting allow such sense. Minds obsessed with a particular doctrine, whether or not it be Scriptural, frequently think they find support of it in almost every chapter of the Bible. They bring together many texts entirely separate from their context and thus seek to prove their doctrine by interpreting them contrary to their historical setting. Such a method of handling Scripture is highly objectionable and misleading.

But this sort of misinterpretation of Scripture has been common among teachers of premillenarianism. Blackstone's "Jesus is Coming" is especially open to criticism in this respect. He finds the Old Testament, especially the prophecies, filled with references to Christ's second coming. We should never think of these as possibly having such a sense unless a premillenarian had told us; for example, Deut. 33:2 and Hosea 6:3. The prophets and Israel were not especially concerned about an event so remote as the second advent. A matter of far more immediate concern to them was the first advent of Christ. The coming of the promised "seed" of Abraham, who would bless the world; the advent of the great "Son of David," who would bring salvation to men—this was that to which the devout of pre-Christian times looked forward. "The Old Testament prophetic passages," says Dr. Snowden, "obviously refer to the first coming of the Messiah, the only coming that had yet risen above the horizon of the prophets, and it is only by a feat of athletic exegesis that these references can be heaved over the first into the second coming." (The Coming of the Lord, p. 38). Only by literal interpretation of symbolic texts and by interpreting many texts apart from their historical setting can premillenarianism find support in many texts.

V. Revelation 20:1-6

Premillenarians find the foundation for their doctrine in this text. Whatever other texts may be appealed to in support

dom of God come with power'' (Mark 9:1). Probably this refers to his manifestation in his majesty at the transfiguration, which is described immediately following. But whenever it was fulfilled, the declaration is clear that the kingdom of God was to be manifested during the first century, while the apostles yet lived. Jesus affirmed before Pilate that he was then a king and then had a kingdom, but it was not an earthly one. All of these texts agree exactly with the prophecies discussed which teach the divine kingdom was set up at the first advent and during the time of the Roman Empire. Because it is already set up and is a spiritual kingdom, the theory that it is an earthly, material kingdom to be established in the future is necessarily false and unscriptural.

IV. Hermeneutic Principles

Correct understanding of the teaching of the Scriptures is dependent upon the observance of sound principles in their interpretation. Interpretation is as necessary to the understanding of the Scriptures as of any other book. While it is true ''the meaning of Scripture is Scripture,'' it is also true, as Peter said, that in the Bible are ''some things hard to be understood.'' The business of the preacher is to interpret, or rightly divide the Word of God (2 Tim. 2:15). Philip interpreted to the Ethiopian eunuch the prophecy of Isaiah which alone the eunuch was unable to understand. The teaching of Jesus and of the apostles is largely interpretation of the Old Testament. No systematic discussion of Biblical hermeneutics is here attempted, but only of such principles as are vital to our present subject.

1. **Literal or Figurative Interpretation.**—The Scriptures, like most other Oriental literature, contain much of figurative and symbolic language. The speech and literature of the modern Western world makes use of figures and symbols to some extent, but the Jews thought and taught much in word pictures. Therefore their literature, both inspired and uninspired, abounds in that which appeals to the eye and the imagination. Jesus spoke often in parables. Whatever difficulties for interpretation may attend the figurative mode of expression of thought, it evidently has much advantage in making truth vivid and impressive.

Most interpreters of the Bible have recognized both the

literal and figurative elements in it. Even Origen recognized this plain sense of Scripture, but in conformity with his theory of its multiple meaning he also interpreted all Scripture allegorically. This "spiritualizing" has been generally rejected as dangerous and unreasonable, and is not to be confused with the recognition of symbols where they exist. But premillenarians hold a principle of literal interpretation which is an extreme opposite to that of the spiritualizing of Origen. They especially interpret literally those texts relating to Christ's kingdom and Israel's glory. They profess to be very much shocked because others do not interpret their favorite texts likewise. They affirm that they are giving superior honor to the Word of God by interpreting it literally at these points. They sometimes go so far as to charge all who disapprove of their extreme literalizing with holding the views of the destructive higher critics. But a spiritual truth is as real as a literal one. God is a pure spirit, incorporeal, yet his existence is as real as is that of a man who has a material body. Likewise a truth may be as truly expressed figuratively as literally.

Examples of spiritual interpretation abound in the Bible itself. Malachi closed his prophecy with a promise that God would send Elijah to reform Israel before the Messiah should come. It must have shocked the literalists of Jesus' day when Christ said of John the Baptist, "If ye will receive it, this is Elias, which was for to come" (Matt. 11:14). Paul recognized a spiritual Israel (Gal. 3:29; Rom. 2:28, 29) also spiritual children of Abraham (Rom. 4:11, 16) and interprets Old Testament texts as referring to them. Elaborate symbols are interpreted in detail in the Book of Daniel, where beasts symbolize empires and horns kings and kingdoms. The Book of Revelation is a book of symbols; candlesticks are churches (Rev. 1:20), and heads and horns represent kingdoms (Rev. 17:10, 12). But the premillennial teacher affirms that we may properly interpret symbolically only in those instances where inspiration has so interpreted or indicated the existence of symbols. We deny the validity of any such principle for interpreting Scripture. Uninspired speech and literature does not always stop to indicate that figures and symbols are being used when they are employed; neither does the Bible. Even premillennialists will, for the most part, forsake this principle when confronted with certain

cussion of the text with full proof of each statement. For this the reader is referred to works dealing particularly with the subject (Christ's Kingdom and Reign, H. M. Riggle; The Revelation Explained, F. G. Smith)*. The Book of Revelation contains six parallel series of prophecies, each of which runs through much of the Christian era. Different series of symbols were needed to set forth different phases of the development of the true religion, as various parables were used by Jesus to represent different aspects of the kingdom of heaven. A new series begins with chapter 20, as do others with chapters 12 and 17. Therefore the events first described in chapter 20 belong near the beginning rather than at the end of the Christian era.

Only one dragon is mentioned in the Revelation. He is first introduced in chap. 12:3 as *a* great red dragon having seven heads and ten horns. In every other mention of him, as in chap. 20:2, he is called *the* dragon as being already known. We have already seen that he can not be the personal devil. His heads and horns, which in chap. 17:10-12 are described as being kingdoms, identify him with the pagan Roman Empire, with its seven supreme forms of government and the ten minor kingdoms growing out of it. This interpretation of the dragon of Revelation 12 has been commonly held by exegetes employing the historical method of interpreting the Revelation. The dragon was bound in the sense that the religious power of paganism was broken by early Christianity. The time he was to remain bound is represented as a thousand years, which is symbolic of a long period of time. Though men continued to be deceived by other false religious powers, yet when the paganism of Rome was overthrown it ceased to deceive them.

During this period in which the pagan power was bound the souls of the martyrs reigned with Christ. That reign took place, not on earth, but in heaven. These souls are disembodied spirits, which are never symbolized in the Revelation. (See Rev. 6:9-11.) These disembodied souls of martyrs reigning with Christ are symbolized when in their embodied condition in chap. 12:5 as a man child which the dragon sought to devour and which was caught up to God and to his throne. In chap. 12:5 they are represented as being born, here as being resurrected (v. 6). This first resurrection is conversion. (Eph. 2:1; Col. 2:13;

*Published by Gospel Trumpet Co., Anderson, Ind.

John 5:24, 25; 1 John 3:14). Those who have had part in the first resurrection are said to be "blessed and holy" (v. 6). It is salvation that makes men so. It is called the "first" resurrection in contrast with the resurrection of the body at the last day. Those who reigned with Christ during the thousand years had had part in this first resurrection, though they were disembodied spirits and the bodies of them were in their graves. But the first resurrection is continued after the thousand-year period (v. 5). This fact entirely excludes the premillenarian theory of a first resurrection of the righteous and another one of the wicked a thousand years later. During the thousand-year period while the pagan power was bound the papacy held sway and salvation work was less common than in the early Christian centuries. Therefore those who have had part in the first resurrection, or have been regenerated, are represented as two groups, one before and one after the thousand years.

With the rise of modern infidelity and opposition to the Bible and Christianity the same dragon power that withstood Christianity in the early centuries is again appearing. The thousand-year period is in the past rather than in the future.

VI. Objections to Premillenarianism

Much ground for objection to premillenarianism is afforded by what has already been said. The theory originated among earthly-minded Jews, who rejected and crucified Christ because he did not come in worldly glory as they had supposed he would do. It has been generally rejected by the church during the ages and is generally regarded today as unscriptural, especially by most great Biblical scholars. Christ's kingdom was established at his first advent; therefore is not to be set up in the future. It is described as being spiritual in its nature; therefore can not be a literal, earthly one. Neither the teachings of Jesus nor any of the epistles contain one word about a millennium. Rev. 20:1-6 has been found not to teach a literal reign of Christ on earth as held by millenarians, but is symbolic of events which are already past. Still other important objections remain to be stated.

1. **No Double Resurrection.**—Premillenarianism requires and holds two literal resurrections, one of the righteous before the millennium and another of the wicked at its end. They assume

of the doctrine, they must all be interpreted in relation to this one. Leading advocates of the theory admit this text is the ultimate support of it. It is the only text that says anything about a thousand years' reign with Christ. If the interpretation of this text which is given by premillenarians be the correct one then the doctrine is Scriptural, but if this text does not teach the doctrine then it is taught nowhere in the Scriptures.

1. **Millenarianism Not Taught.**—Rev. 20 : 1-6 declares the dragon is bound a thousand years, during which time certain of the righteous are said to reign with Christ. On its surface this text may appear to teach millenarianism, especially to one who already has the idea in his mind. But upon a more careful examination it is apparent no such doctrine is contained in it. A literal interpretation of the text is essential to its furnishing support for millenarianism. But it is located in what is generally conceded to be the most highly symbolic of all the books of the Bible, and this text is itself as highly symbolic as is any in that symbolic book. Correct principles of hermeneutics absolutely forbid a literal interpretation of this text in total disregard of its context. The premillenarian interpretation of this is a striking example of improper literal interpretation by the teachers of it. That the text under consideration is not to be literally interpreted and that it does not teach the millenarian doctrine is held by the large majority of the most devout and careful thinking of evangelical writers. Dr. Miley says on this text: "This may be said, first, that the passage contains not a word respecting any advent of Christ, nor a word respecting his reigning personally on the earth. Further, it is in a highly figurative or symbolical book, and is itself highly symbolical. Consequently the construction of the theory of the advent on such ground is without the warrant of any principle of doctrinal formation, and the more certainly so as there are many explicit texts on the subject" (Systematic Theology, Vol. 2, p. 443). This is but an example of statements by many equally eminent theologians of different denominations, including A. H. Strong, Minor Raymond, H. C. Sheldon, A. A. Hodge, Adam Clarke, and J. H. Snowden.

Not only is literal interpretation of this text a violation of sound hermeneutic principles, but its implication of an earthly, literal reign of Christ and two physical resurrections is contrary

to other plain texts (John 5:28, 29; Dan. 12:2). One plain text of Scripture is enough to support a doctrine, but if a text is generally admitted to be symbolic and obscure, it should be interpreted in accordance with plain texts, not they in accordance with it.

But even if a literal interpretation of the text were permissible it would still not give the support to the millenarian theory it is usually supposed by its advocates to afford. Much of that theory is read into the text rather than out of it. Nothing is said in the passage under consideration about the second advent of Christ. That is *assumed* to take place at the time of the events here described. There is no proof the angel of verse 1 is Christ. He always appears in his own person unsymbolized in the Revelation, as in chap. 19:11-16. Again it is assumed that the dragon is the literal devil. But in the twelfth chapter he is said to have seven heads and ten horns and with his tail to draw the third part of the stars of heaven and to cast them to the earth (Rev. 12:3, 4). In chap. 17:10-12 those heads and horns are said to be kingdoms. Who can suppose Satan, the archfiend and an evil spirit, has these kingdoms for heads and horns, or that he has a tail capable of the great feat here described? The terms "serpent," "devil," and "Satan" are themselves symbols of an antiChristian power.

Again, this text says nothing of a reign on the earth. The reign was to be "with Christ," and Christ is in heaven. Still further, there are no resurrected bodies in this part of the chapter. They are "souls" of those beheaded who are to reign with Christ. Moreover, not all the righteous dead are said to reign with him, but only those who were "beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God." Finally, in clear contradiction to the millenarian theory that the first resurrection is of the bodies of the righteous dead, the fifth verse declares that the *living again of the rest of the dead* after the thousand-year period is the *"first resurrection."* In view of all of these difficulties, this text, which is supposed to be the foundation of it, certainly furnishes no adequate ground for the doctrine.

2. **Exegesis of Revelation 20:1-6.**—The text in question is capable of a symbolic meaning and with the proof that it is properly so interpreted the literal interpretation and this text as a support of millenarianism are excluded. Space forbids an elaborate dis-

Jerusalem is to be rebuilt, and will possess a temple far larger and more magnificent than before, the size of which is given by Ezekiel. The city will not merely be the seat of rule exercised over Israel; but the metropolis of government for the world-wide worship of God. In the past its sacrifices and oblations pointed on to Christ; but these, restored in the millennium, will be offered in memory of the work which Jesus accomplished on the cross'' (God's Methods With Man, pp. 117-118).

An attempt is here made to show these alleged sacrifices of the millennial age, which are supposed to be described in Ezek. 40-48 and Isa. 66:20, 23, are to be offered, not for atonement, nor for a type of it, but as a memorial of the accomplished atonement of Christ. But such a theory can not be admitted, for in Ezek. 43:19, 20, it is said, ''Thou shalt give to the priests . . . a young bullock for a sin-offering. And thou shalt take of the blood thereof, and put it on the four horns of it, and on the four corners of the ledge, and upon the border round about: thus shalt thou cleanse it and make atonement for it'' (A. S. V.). If in that future age these offerings are thus to be offered for sin then the inspired writer to the Hebrews was in error in saying, ''We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ *once for all''* (Heb. 10:10); and *''by one offering* he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified'' (v. 14); also ''now where remission of these is, there is *no more offering for sin''* (v. 18). How much more reasonable to recognize the symbolic element in these prophecies, and the glory there predicted as pertaining to the glorious church of God in the Christian dispensation! Such an interpretation accords perfectly with the entire New Testament.

3. **No Three Comings of Christ.**—Doubtless the Scriptures teach two advents of Christ to this world, one of which is past and the other in the future. Premillenarians, however, expect yet two comings of Christ in the future. Of these future comings, they affirm that he will first come to resurrect the dead saints and catch up into the air with them those saints who are yet living. This coming is called by premillenarians ''the rapture,'' which means to be caught up. At a later time, they affirm, he will come again *with* his saints, when he will be visible to all. This is called ''the revelation.'' (See Blackstone, Jesus Is Coming,

p. 75). The idea of these two supposed future comings of Christ is an essential element of their theory.

They depend for support of this distinction principally upon 1 Thess. 4:14-17. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." The whole purpose of the Apostle in writing these words was to tell the order of God's dealings with the righteous at Christ's coming and thus allay the fears of those to whom he wrote about their dead brethren. The wicked are left out of the consideration entirely. Therefore the statement that "the dead in Christ shall rise first" has no reference to the time of their resurrection in relation to the resurrection of the wicked, but as is clear from the following verse it is "first" in relation to those righteous living at Christ's coming, who will then be caught up together with the resurrected righteous who have died. This text gives support neither to a double resurrection nor to two future comings of Christ.

But, it is argued by Blackstone, Christ must first come *for* his saints before he can come *with* them. This is to deny that the spirits of the righteous dead are now with Christ in heaven, which Paul affirms (2 Cor. 5:8; Phil. 1:21). All which Christ is to accomplish when he comes in the future can and will be accomplished at one coming. The Bible teaches but one future advent of Christ. With the disproof of three advents, two resurrections, and a millennium, no ground remains for affirming four judgments, as is done by premillenarians.

4. **No Great Tribulation.**—According to premillenarians the period between the supposed rapture and revelation, which they usually regard as seven years in duration, identifying it with the seventieth week of Dan. 9:27, will be a time of great tribulation to the wicked, who are to be left on the earth during that time. They describe this period in many details and appear to have almost superhuman knowledge concerning it. (See Blackstone,

that these are taught in Rev. 20:1-6, but we have already shown that assumption to be erroneous. Blackstone attempts to show (Jesus Is Coming, p. 59) that two resurrections are recognized throughout the Bible by the use in the Greek text of ἐκ (*ek*)—from among, or out of—in relation to the resurrection of the righteous. He affirms that by the use of this word only in relation to the resurrection of the righteous, they are represented as raised from among the dead ones, implying that some dead ones are not raised up at that time. Dr. David Brown in his "Second Advent" says this distinction "will not bear an hour's examination of the Greek Testament." Dr. Snowden says, "The expression 'resurrection of the dead' (without *ek*) is not only applied expressly to the resurrection of both classes, but specifically to that resurrection which is peculiar to believers (1 Cor. 15:42), and even to the resurrection of Christ himself (Acts 26:23). Not only so, but the same Greek preposition (*ek*) occurs in other passages where no one would think it means 'from amongst,' as in John 6:26, 'because ye ate of the loaves,' and Gal. 3:7, 'they that are of faith.' In most cases this preposition is translated simply 'from' and has no such meaning as this unscholarly premillenarian interpretation seeks to place upon it" (The Coming of the Lord, p. 176). Any one familiar with the common Greek usage of the term in question will readily recognize the weakness of the argument based upon it.

Not only does the theory of a double resurrection fail to find support in the use of the Greek term discussed in the foregoing paragraph and in Rev. 20:1-6, but the general teaching of Scripture concerning the simultaneous resurrection of both righteous and wicked excludes it. "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation" (John 5:28, 29). At a particular "hour" or time "all" the dead, both good and evil, shall be raised up. "So man lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep" (Job 14:12). Men are to be raised only at the time when the heavens cease to be, according to this text. No room is allowed for the resurrection of the righteous a thousand years before that time. "There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust" (Acts

24:15). But one resurrection is here mentioned; the word is in the singular number. Yet that resurrection is to include both the just and unjust. In Rev. 20:11-15 is a description of the last judgment scene. "And I saw the dead [not those who had been living in resurrected bodies a thousand years], small and great, stand before God; and the *books* were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." These verses teach oneness of the judgment and also of the resurrection for good and evil. Only by a forced interpretation of these four passages can their plain teaching of oneness of the resurrection be avoided.

2. **No Restoration of Judaism.**—Many things predicted of Judah and Jerusalem have never been literally fulfilled. But the principle of literal interpretation which is held with so great tenacity by premillenarians requires that these shall be literally fulfilled. In conformity with the requirements of their logic, premillenarians affirm that these predictions will be accomplished in a restored Judaism, that the Jews shall return to Palestine, Jerusalem shall be restored to them, Christ shall rule over the Jews there, the temple shall be rebuilt, and all its system of ceremonies and sacrifices again instituted. That bloody animal sacrifices should again be offered to God on an altar for a thousand years is shocking to most Christian readers of the epistle to the Hebrews and of the writings of Paul, in which such sacrifices are constantly represented as being a shadow of the sacrifice of Christ for the sins of the world, and as having passed away when that which they predicted was accomplished. Even some premillenarians are evidently shocked by such an idea. Though their logic requires such return to Judaistic practises, yet some of them inconsistently refuse to admit its reality. But many of them, including several of their highest authorities, unhesitatingly teach the reestablishment of the entire ritual of Mosaic sacrifices.

Probably no higher or more widely recognized authority on premillenarianism can be cited than Dr. G. Campbell Morgan. In writing on "The Golden Age" he says, "Palestine, reinhabited by the nation of Israel, is to be redivided; and each tribe will return, not to the section of land previously occupied, but to a portion which stretches from the seaboard across the land.

stand many predictions of the world-wide worship of Jehovah, it is important to remember that the true religion was anciently confined to the people of Israel. By the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles the knowledge of the true religion has spread over the earth. "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord" (Psa. 22: 27). "All the ends of the earth shall fear him" (Psa. 67:7). These merely predict the salvation of persons in the remotest nations of earth, and the prediction is being fulfilled today. That this is the correct interpretation is certain from Paul's interpretation in Acts 13: 47 of a similar expression found in Isa. 42:6. In Isa. 2:2 it is said of the mountain of the Lord's house that "all nations shall flow unto it." The "mountain of the Lord's House" is the church. What is said of it was to take place in the last days, which is the present Christian dispensation (Heb. 1:2). Not only the Jews, but men of all nations are now included in God's church. The worship of the true God is becoming world-wide. "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea" (Isa. 11:9). It is no longer confined to the Israelitish nation, but is now the heritage of all nations. Such an interpretation of these texts has New Testament support.

2. **Universal Peace, Blessings, and Prosperity.**—The question is sometimes asked, When shall men "beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks"? (Isa. 2:4). According to the context this is to take place among those who are in God's church. Regeneration makes men peaceable. The same idea is expressed in the prediction of peace among animals (Isa. 11:6-9). "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain," which means the church. Through salvation men are made peaceable. In Isa. 35:1 is the statement that "the desert . . . shall blossom as the rose." In verse 6 we read, "In the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert." But when shall this be? In that same verse and the preceding one is the prediction that "the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing." Jesus' answer to the messengers of John the Baptist is practically an application of the text in Isaiah 35 to his own time. Doubtless the beautiful words of the prophet are a figurative representa-

tion of the blessings of the kingdom of Christ at the present time.

Space does not allow a consideration of other texts of Scripture which premillenarians frequently interpret in support of their theory. What has been said under "Hermeneutic Principles" and the examples of interpretation in foregoing pages sufficiently show, not only that another than the premillenarian interpretation is reasonable, but also the correct one. Certainly the many conclusive arguments which show the falsity of the theory are exclusive of any strained interpretations of texts in support of it.

Jesus Is Coming, p. 98.) But the whole idea is an ungrounded assumption. Various texts are supposed to refer to it, but no true exegesis of them finds any such meaning. The "great tribulation" of Matt. 24:21 refers to the great suffering of the Jews at the destruction of Jerusalem, which is certainly the point of discussion beginning with v. 15. There is no reason for understanding that this or other texts appealed to in this connection teach such a period of trouble as they are assumed to teach.

5. **No Personal Antichrist.**—During the period of great tribulation, premillenarians hold that the world will be ruled by a personal antichrist. They regard the antichrist power described in 2 Thess. 2:3-12 as being the one who shall rule during the "tribulation." He is supposed to be a person rather than a spirit of antichrist, because he is called "that *man* of sin." But "man" does not always refer to a person. It may refer to a power or a body of people. An example of such a use is found in Eph. 2:15 where the church, that body composed of both Jews and Gentiles, is called "one new man." In a former chapter this "man of sin" was shown to be the papacy. Such has been the common Protestant understanding of it.

Antichrist is not to arise in the future. He has already come. "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world" (1 John 4:3). The inspired writer here uses the term in its broad etymological sense of being opposed to Christ. Whatever is opposed to Christ is antichrist. Here the premillenarian objects that it is said that only the *spirit* of antichrist is now in the world. But the same writer says more. "As ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time" (1 John 2:18).

6. **No Need, Time, Nor Place for Millennium.**—God has a purpose in all he does. In all that premillenarians hold concerning the supposed reign of Christ on earth, there does not appear an important purpose to be attained. No millennium is necessary to the salvation of men. Perfect conditions for probation of free moral beings now exist. The lack of divine compulsion on the one hand and the drawing of God's Spirit on the other hand,

along with man's freedom, make the choice of salvation and a life of holiness possible without making it necessary. If more miraculous, divine manifestations were more conducive to the salvation of men and yet consistent with their moral freedom, then the lack of those manifestations in this present age reflects on the goodness and holiness of God. To whatever extent men may be constrained by supernatural manifestations of power in a future age to serve God, to that extent they cease to serve him freely. But God's glory demands that men serve him from free choice. "Whosoever will" may be saved now. Even the Jews can have no better opportunity for salvation in the future.

No millennium is needed for man's happiness. Surely the imaginary joys of a millennial age can not exceed the blessedness of heaven. Therefore a millennium can afford no advantage in human happiness over the entrance of the righteous to heaven instead. Neither is a millennium needed for the divine glory. Christ rules the physical universe now, and also the moral universe. He rules in the moral realm, not by depriving men of freedom and compelling them to do good, but by his bringing them to account for their acts, which is the highest form of government. Wickedness prevails now only as God permits it in consistency with his moral government. But every knee shall bow to him in the day of final retribution.

The Scriptural order of events at the advent of Christ allows no time for a millennium. When Christ comes all the dead will be immediately raised (John 5:28, 29); they will be raised by the "trump of God" (1 Thess. 4:16), which is the "last trump" (1 Cor. 15:52). There is no trump after the last. Then the eternal state begins. When Christ comes the judgment will take place and men shall at once enter upon their eternal states (Matt. 25:31; 2 Thess. 1:8; Matt. 16:27).

Neither do the Scriptures allow any place for a millennium. The earth is to be destroyed on the occasion of his coming. This is clear from 2 Pet. 3:4-12. The "coming" of the Lord (v. 4) is called the "day of the Lord" (v. 10). The Apostle states that the earth and the works in it will on that day be burned up. This leaves no place for a thousand-year reign of Christ on earth at his coming.

VII. Premillenarian Questions

1. **The Earth Full of the Knowledge of the Lord.**—To under-

future personal coming of Christ. This has been denied by the "liberal theology." A leading representative of this view, W. N. Clarke, says, "No visible return of Christ to the earth is to be expected" (An Outline of Christian Theology, p. 444). He finds the promised coming of Christ in all the different special divine workings since the ascension of Christ to heaven, and especially in the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost.

Doubtless the expression "coming of the Lord" is used in the Scriptures in other senses than of his personal, visible coming. The disciples saw the "Son of man coming in his kingdom" (Matt. 16:28). At the transfiguration Christ the king was revealed in his majesty though his kingdom was not fully established until Pentecost. In the statement "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you" (John 14:18), the coming of the Holy Spirit is doubtless referred to. Also the personal second advent of Christ can not be meant when in the message to the church of Pergamos he said, "Repent, . . . or else I will come unto thee quickly" (Rev. 2:6). Another text that can not refer to the second personal advent is Matt. 10:23, "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." Certainly Christ has often come during the last nineteen hundred years in this sense of special manifestations of his workings. But such a sense of his coming can not properly be thought of as the only mode of it. The Scriptures also clearly teach a second, personal, visible coming of Christ which is yet future.

As the straining eyes of the wondering disciples saw their ascending Lord rise higher and higher until a cloud finally obscured him from their view, two angels said to them, "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven" (Acts 1:11). As the ascension was visible and personal, so will be his second advent, according to these words. "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven" (Matt. 26:64). "Then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory" (Matt. 24:30). "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him" (Rev. 1:7). Only a greatly

strained interpretation can find in these texts other than a personal, visible, future coming of Christ. The coming in the clouds, with glory and power, with all the angels, with the spirits of the righteous dead (1 Thess. 4:14), and "with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God" (1 Thess. 4:16) all are congruous only with a personal coming of Christ.

There can be no doubt that the apostles understood that Christ would return to earth in person. Even rationalistic interpreters admit this, but assume that they were mistaken and consequently were disappointed. The apostles and early Christians were "looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ" (Titus 2:13). "Our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ" (Phil. 3:20). "Unblameable in holiness. . . at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints" (1 Thess. 3:13). The visible, personal advent of Christ was the great object of their expectation. They expected this because Jesus had clearly promised it. To interpret the predictions of the second advent of Jesus as a spiritual coming is as unreasonable as it is for modern rationalistic Jews to interpret the predictions of the first coming of Christ as a spiritual coming the way they are now doing. As his first advent was personal, so is the second coming of Christ to be personal.

Matt. 24:34 has been assumed to be opposed to the idea of a second personal coming of Christ. "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." Three events are under consideration in this chapter—the destruction of Jerusalem, the second advent, and the end of the world. Whether it has any bearing on the nature of the second coming is dependent in a measure on whether "all these things" have reference to the second advent, or only to the destruction of Jerusalem. If the latter is meant, then that event occurred forty years later and during the generation living when Jesus spoke these words. But if "all these things" have reference to the second advent, the text still does not bar the idea of a personal advent of Christ. The Greek term rendered "generation" may be translated "race." Then it is a prediction that the Jewish race will endure until the second coming of Christ. Such a prediction is appropriate and harmonious with the context, which represents awful tribulation as coming upon the Jews. Certainly the text

Chapter III

CHRIST'S SECOND ADVENT AND ITS CONCOMITANTS

The great events of Christian eschatology are the second advent of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the general judgment, and the end of the world. Like all future events, the reality of these can not be naturally known. Yet we have *good* ground for our belief in them in the many predictions of their occurrence in the Scriptures. The extent to which we may know the order of events at Christ's advent and their nature in detail is determined by the nature and purpose of Scripture prophecy.

Not uncommonly have interpreters of the Biblical prophecies assumed that those predictions were of the nature of inverted history by which God has given to us a plan in detail of all the future events there predicted. Such interpreters, in whose ranks are many premillenarians, set forth elaborate schemes of eschatological events, describing in detail the several stages of the process, often by means of complex diagrams, and frequently going so far as to set the time when Christ will come. That some of these are erroneous has been shown by the failure of their accomplishment at the time set. Prophecy is not primarily for the purpose of instruction. Evidently it does afford a certain amount of instruction, but that is subordinate to its primary purpose, which is moral impression.

Much may be known of the nature of unfulfilled prophecy relative to Christ's second advent, and prophecy in general, by a careful study of that which relates to his first advent, which has been fulfilled. Concerning the first advent of Christ, it was predicted that he would be a prophet like unto Moses, a priest greater than Aaron, and a king mightier than David. He was to reign in righteousness and great glory, and wonderful works were to be accomplished. Viewing those predictions in the light of their fulfilment, it is clear that they have been fulfilled in detail in a wonderful manner. But until they were fulfilled but few of the details were ever correctly understood even by the most spiritually-minded. With all the instruction Jesus had given his apostles, they still expected him to set up an earthly kingdom after his resurrection. But the failure of the devout Jew properly to understand those prophecies of Jesus' first advent did not deprive him of the religious and moral benefit which

God intended they should afford. They awakened in him anticipation and hope of future deliverance and by so doing led him to be prepared for the events predicted. So the predictions of the second advent have practical value principally in influencing men to be ready to meet Christ at his coming. The leading purpose of these prophecies is to make a general impression conducive to spiritual excellence, not to furnish us a plan in detail of the future. Much is left in obscurity concerning the second coming and concomitant events.

I. The Second Coming of Christ

We are living between two advents of Christ to this world. At the first he appeared incarnate to reveal the way of salvation and to make atonement for sin. He will come again at some future time in great power and glory to raise the dead, judge the world, and destroy the earth. The questions of special interest in connection with his second advent are concerning the fact, the nature, and the time of his coming.

1. **The Fact of His Coming.**—That Christ will come again to the world is the common belief of Christians of all schools of thought. Infidels may scoff and say, "Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." But those who believe the New Testament have abundant proof that Jesus will surely come again. "If I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself" (John 14:3). "As the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be" (Matt. 24:27). "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven" (1 Thess. 4:16). "Our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ" (Phil. 3:20). "Unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation" (Heb. 9:28). Very many other texts might be cited in proof of the fact of a future advent of Christ to this world. That advent is represented in the Scriptures as necessary to the accomplishment of other important events, especially the resurrection, the judgment, and the end of the world.

2. **The Nature of His Coming.**—Though the fact of the Lord's coming is generally held by Christians, yet all do not allow a

Doubtless the means of rapid travel and quick communication provided by modern invention will mean much in hastening the spread of the gospel. But we are not told how thorough must be that evangelization of the world, neither can we be certain that the end will come immediately when it is accomplished. Therefore it may be properly said that we can not determine by any signs except in a very general way the time of Christ's second coming.

II. The General Resurrection

1. **The Fact of a General Resurrection.**—The doctrine of a resurrection of the dead is commonly believed by Christians, though there are differences of understanding concerning what is signified by the expression. No doctrine has a surer basis in the Scriptures than does this. The words "general resurrection" have reference to the resurrection of all the dead, both the wicked and the righteous, as distinguished from the resurrection of Christ, of others by Jesus or holy men of the past, or of a resurrection of the righteous first and of the wicked at a later time. A general resurrection is taught by the Bible. "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan. 12:2). "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation" (John 5:28, 29). "There shall be *a* resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust" (Acts 24:15). All these texts clearly teach a general resurrection. The same truth is definitely implied in all those texts which state that the righteous shall be raised up "at the last day" (John 6:39, 40, 44, 54). There is no day after the last day, and evidently no resurrection can take place a thousand years after the last day. But the singleness of the resurrection has been already shown in the preceding chapter and need not be **further discussed here.**

The resurrection will take place coincident with the second coming of Christ. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from his goats" (Matt. 25:31, 32).

That the dead will be raised at the time of the second advent is clear from 1 Thess. 4:16, also 1 Cor. 15:23. These two texts and the whole of 1 Cor. 15 discuss particularly the resurrection of the righteous, because conditions required the discussion of only that, but with the singleness of the resurrection proved, these texts for the most part are applicable to the subject of the general resurrection.

The fact of the resurrection is clearly taught by revelation, but can not be otherwise known. All attempts to show that reason requires it are fruitless. It can not properly be reasoned that the resurrection of the body is necessary to the future life of the soul. Neither may it be properly said that because the body is a sharer in probation, it must therefore be raised in order to share in future retribution. The body is but an instrument of the spirit and in no wise responsible for the acts done by it. Though reason can not furnish evidence of a resurrection, yet with the Scripture supporting the doctrine it may readily be reasoned that it is advantageous in making more real to the average person the truth of future existence and in inspiring hope of life hereafter.

2. **The Nature of the Resurrected Bodies.**—The resurrected body is a material body, though it is greatly different from natural bodies in that it is immortalized and glorified. If that be not a material body which is to exist in the future, then is there no resurrection. The very idea of resurrection implies that that be raised up which has fallen down or died. The spirit does not die, but has continuous conscious existence after death; therefore it can not be the subject of the resurrection from the dead. Only the body dies; therefore only it can be raised from the dead. If it be objected that "it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body," let it be said in reply that it is spiritual only as to state and as distinguished from the "natural body." The resurrection is a transformation, not a transubstantiation, as would be true if the essence of the resurrected body were spirit rather than matter. Also if it were of the same essence with the spirit, then would the spirit be incorporated in a spirit.

The resurrection of Christ is both a proof of the fact and an example of the nature of the general resurrection. "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept" (1 Cor. 15:20). His dead body was laid in the tomb.

is too obscure to furnish a valid ground of objection to the personal advent, which is clear in other texts.

3. **The Time of His Coming.**—The time when Christ will return to earth is fully known to God. Being possessed of complete prescience, he must necessarily have knowledge of this as of all other future events. That he does know it is affirmed by Paul. "He hath appointed a day, in which he will judge the world" (Acts 17:31). To "appoint" means to "determine" or "set."

But while God knows the time of the second coming of Christ, it is known to no man. "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only" (Matt. 24:36). To most men living when he comes, the advent of Christ will be unexpected. It is not to be preceded by any great change in the natural order of things. "As the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be" (Matt. 24:37-39). In this text the moral state of the world at Christ's coming is not under consideration. It merely shows that as that awful catastrophe came suddenly and without warning, so the second advent will be unexpected by the world at large. "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night" (2 Pet. 3:10). It will come when not expected and find many unprepared. A knowledge of the time of the Lord's coming is not important to men. Their ignorance of the time when they will be called upon to give account for their deeds is harmonious with the best conditions of probation. Men ought always to be ready to meet him.

However, the fact that no man knew in Jesus' day when Christ will come is no proof that some of the righteous may not have certain premonitions of his coming immediately before the event. Though the antedeluvians were not expecting a flood when it came, yet Noah was divinely informed of it. Jesus' use of this illustration does not necessarily imply that the righteous will be forewarned of Christ's coming, but it is not inharmonious with such an idea. But evidently whatever might be made known to the righteous as to the near approach of the end of the world, it will not be inconsistent with proper conditions of

probation for the world at large. It will not be such knowledge as will make possible dependable prophecies of the exact time of the end. All such prophecies may well be regarded as unworthy of belief.

4. **The Signs of His Coming.**—The discourse in Matthew 24 and 25 is Jesus' answer to the three questions of his disciples "When shall these things be [the destruction of the temple]? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" (Matt. 24:3). As the disciples evidently thought of these events as simultaneous, so Jesus answered the questions without indicating clearly in all cases of which event he spoke. He gave some practical information about the sign of the destruction of Jerusalem and urged his disciples to flee from the city when that sign was seen. But no clear sign was given by him by which the near approach of the end of the world may be known. Jesus rather devoted the larger part of his discourse to warning them always to be ready, for the time of his coming could not be known by them.

There are, however, in various places in the New Testament predictions of events to take place before the end of the world. As long as those events have not taken place the end is not yet. This was Paul's argument to the Thessalonians (2 Thess. 2:3-8). Christ was not to come until there first came a "falling away" or an apostasy. Not only in this text, but also in other places, especially in the symbolic prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation, is this great apostasy foretold. In these two books of the Bible and elsewhere are also predictions of a restoration from the apostasy, a time when the gospel light would again shine (Zech. 14:6, 7). Again Jesus said, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come" (Matt. 24:14).

Doubtless the great apostasy has come and is largely past. This bar, then, to the advent of Christ does not now exist as in Paul's day. The restoration of truth predicted is also evidently being now accomplished. We are now in the "evening time," but the extent to which "it shall be light," or how long the evening time shall continue we have no means of knowing. Now as never before in the history of Christianity is the gospel being preached to all nations. The length of time that will elapse before the world shall be evangelized can only be conjectured.

When he was resurrected that body disappeared from the tomb. It, not another body, was raised from the dead, as was evident from the scars of the nails and of the spear in it. It was a material body that could be known through the senses of sight and touch, as only matter can be known.

The entire fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians is devoted to the discussion of the fact of the resurrection and the nature of the resurrected body. It is addressed to Grecian Christians who were meeting the Gnostic philosophy. This philosophy assumed that matter is essentially evil and that disembodied spirits are much happier without bodies; therefore it was said "there is no resurrection of the dead." In answering the objectors' question, "With what body do they come?" Paul does not disallow the materiality of the resurrected body, as he would have done had such an admission been according to the truth, but he rather shows that the body is so changed that it ceases to possess objectionable qualities. "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body" (vs. 42-44).

We can know but little concerning the essential nature and powers of the resurrected body. We have nothing in experience with which to compare it. The Scripture tells us somewhat concerning Jesus' resurrected body, but we have no means of knowing how much of the phenomena recorded of it is to be attributed to its essential nature and what was the result of his divine power such as he displayed before his crucifixion, as when he walked on the water. Neither do we know what changes may have occurred in it at the ascension. His being able to enter a room with the doors closed and to vanish similarly may have been in spite of the essential nature of his body. We know the resurrected bodies will be immortal; "Neither can they die any more" (Luke 20:36). Matter as we now know it is so constituted internally and so conditioned externally that it is subject to dissolution. God will so change the resurrection body as to internal constitution and so condition it that it will be incorruptible. In view of the power of God to do this, the immortality of matter is not impossible. The resurrected body is raised in "glory," whatever that may mean. It may reasonably be assumed from the words "it is raised in power" that

the resurrected body will be free from all defects and mutilations. Christ's body bearing the scars was probably an exception for a special purpose.

3. **The Question of Identity.**—In some sense the resurrection body will be identical with the body which is placed in the grave. If the body in which we die is not the subject of the resurrection, then that future body will not be a resurrected body, but a new creation. But the Scriptures teach a resurrection of dead bodies, not a transmigration of spirits to newly created bodies. That this is true was exemplified in Christ, who was the first-fruits of them that slept. His dead body which was laid in the tomb was raised to live again. Jesus said to those who required a sign, "Destroy *this* body, and in three days I will raise *it* up again." He did not say he would find or create another body if the first were destroyed.

But there may be distinguished an absolute identity and also a proper identity. An absolute identity requires every particle of which the body is composed at a particular time. A proper identity requires only such a degree of sameness as is true of the body at widely separated periods of the present life. We are told that each seven years throughout life every atom in the body is exchanged for another. If we meet a friend after a lapse of ten or twenty years we recognize him though he has an entirely new body as to the matter of which it is composed. Yet in a proper sense he possesses the same body as formerly. It is practically identical as to shape, size, and appearance. It is identical in a real sense. This at least illustrates the possibility of practical identity of the resurrection body with that which dies without its being absolutely identical.

Such a view of identity also furnishes an answer to some of the common objections to the idea of a resurrection. It is reasoned that a man's body decays and crumbles to dust, from which vegetation grows, and this vegetation is eaten by other men so that some of the atoms that formed the body of the first man come also to be included as a constituent part of the body of the second. Instances of cannibalism are cited as similarly making confusion for a resurrection. Great confusion of particles of bodies is conceivable, but doubtless no great difficulty really exists at this point, even for an absolute identity of the body that is raised with that which dies. But however great

may be the difficulties the idea of proper identity meets them all. As to any mere scattering of the atoms of a particular body, no difficulty shall exist for the omnipresent and almighty God if his purpose requires in order to resurrection a bringing together of the identical matter of the body which dies.

III. The Final Judgment

1. **Truth of a Future Judgment.**—Almost no religious idea, unless it be the truth of the Divine existence, has been more generally believed by all men than that of a future judgment. Underlying this truth are the ideas of the justice of God, his moral government, and human probation. The very nature of probation is such that the execution of judgment is implied. That judgment can not be executed in full until the close of probation is also implied. Fully to punish sin during the probationary period would be to cause men to refrain from sin for fear of punishment rather than from love for God and righteousness. A future judgment beyond this life is a requirement of reason especially because of the lack of a full execution of justice in the present state. The righteous do not always receive in this life the reward of their righteousness, nor are the wicked fully punished according to their iniquity. Because justice is not accomplished here, there will be a time of judgment beyond this life.

The Scriptures very definitely set forth the fact of a future judgment. "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished" (2 Pet. 2:9). "He hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained" (Acts 17:31). "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ" (Rom. 14:10). "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee" (Matt. 11:24). The people of Sodom had long since died, but Jesus here represents their judgment as yet future. It will be coincident with the advent of Christ. The most elaborate and specific account of the judgment given in the Bible is that contained in Matt. 25:31-46, where it is represented as taking place immediately following the second coming of Christ. "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man

according to his works'' (Matt. 16:27). ''The Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom'' (2 Tim. 4:1).

The judgment will take place after the general resurrection. ''For the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation'' (John 5:28, 29). The distribution of reward and punishment subsequent to the resurrection implies the judgment. ''And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works'' (Rev. 20:12, 13). The statement that the sea gave up the dead which were in it implies the resurrection. Subsequent to that the judgment is said to occur. It is to occur at the end of the world. ''Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn. . . . The harvest is the end of the world. . . . So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just'' (Matt. 13:30, 39, 49).

It is not a protracted process, but a definite time, a *day*. ''Day'' here signifies a definite time whether it be longer or shorter than twenty-four hours. ''Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment'' (Matt. 12:36). Several of the foregoing texts describe it as being a ''day.''

Various unscriptural theories are held concerning the judgment: (1) that the day of judgment is the gospel dispensation; (2) that the judgment of each individual is God's rule over him throughout this life; (3) that the judgment-day is a future millennial age when Christ will judge the world in the sense of ruling over it; (4) that the only judgment is the natural consequence of good and evil in the sense of reward and punishment; (5) and the rationalistic view that there will be no time

of general manifestation of righteousness, but that judgment consists only of rewarding or punishing men. The Scripture texts cited sufficiently refute all these theories.

2. **Nature of the Final Judgment.**—The future judgment will be a general judgment in the sense that all men both good and evil will be judged at one and the same time. No rational evidence of a general judgment is possible, but the Scriptures are replete with such proofs. Several texts concerning the future judgment already quoted represent it as a general judgment. This is especially clear in the discourse of Jesus recorded in Matt. 25:31-46. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. . . . Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (vs. 31-34, 41). Certainly these words are intelligible only as interpreted of a general judgment.

We are dependent principally upon the foregoing words of Jesus and upon the description given in Rev. 20:11-15 for whatever we may know concerning the manner of the final judgment. In both texts the judgment is represented as being conducted as court trials were commonly conducted by Oriental kings and rulers of that time. The judge, Christ, is to sit upon a great white throne of glory. As officers of the law arrest men and bring them before the judge, so the angels will bring all men before Christ for judgment. Rewards and punishments are meted out according to their works and the Revelator represents them as judged "out of the books." To what extent are these descriptions figurative and to what extent do they describe the actual manner of the final judgment? Doubtless the account in Revelation 20 is symbolic as is the Book of Revelation in general. The account by Jesus in Matthew 25 is probably best understood as a parable or a figurative representation. There has been much speculation in the past concerning the manner in which the judgment should be arranged so the countless mil-

lions of earth shall be able to gather before the throne of the judge. That throne has usually been assumed to be so high that it will be visible from a large portion of the earth, as is the sun. But this is only speculation. That any such literal process of adjudication as described will take place in which the judge will converse with the different groups is doubtful. These descriptions of the judgment scene are designed to teach great moral truths, not the outward form of the proceedings. Doubtless those descriptions set forth the truth of a real judgment and are calculated to make a deep impression on men's minds as to the solemnity of it, but only speculation is possible as to the exact manner of it, and speculation is useless.

Christ will be the judge. "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son" (John 5:22). It is appropriate that he who is the Savior of men and who died to save them should be their judge. He who was tempted in all points like as we are, therefore is qualified to sympathize with us, and yet as infinite in all perfections is well qualified justly to judge the world. The subjects of the judgment are all men. Probably the evil angels who are delivered "into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment" (2 Pet. 2:4) will be judged at the time men are judged.

3. **Object of the Final Judgment.**—The question may well be asked, If immediately succeeding death retribution comes upon men, if the righteous are comforted in Paradise as was Lazarus, the beggar, and if the wicked are tormented in hell as was the rich man, then what can be the value of a general judgment? Doubtless these retributions are according to men's characters; consequently character must be known to God and to the individual who is rewarded or punished at the time of his death. Therefore the final judgment can not properly be thought of as a time for the ascertainment of character. Probably the object of it is not revealed. We are assured of the fact of a general judgment when Christ comes, and we believe in it because it is taught by the Scriptures. We believe in it even if we can not explain it.

Though we may be unable to give all the reasons for a general judgment and possibly not the principal ones, yet some reasons for it are apparent. It will be a time, not for the ascertainment of character, but for the manifestation of it. Then

God will assign *just* retribution. It will furnish a declaration of the uprightness of God to all moral beings as does the death of Christ now. A general judgment is unnecessary to the distribution of just reward and punishment. All of that might be effected between God and the individual alone. But for the full and complete exhibition and proclamation of divine justice toward all moral beings, fully to make known the glory of the divine administration, a general judgment is important.

4. **Standards of the Final Judgment.**—Jesus said of those who rejected his words, "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day" (John 12:48). Paul said, "For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law" (Rom. 2:12). The Word of God is the primary standard of judgment. In the nature of things men are obligated to obey whatever commandments God has given them. But they are responsible and amenable to God's law only so far as that law has been given to *them*. Only those to whom the Mosaic law was given shall be judged by it. Only those who know the teachings of the New Testament as the law of God may properly be judged by it. Merely to have lived during the dispensation of one or the other of these laws does not of itself make one amenable to that law. The unevangelized people of the present time are, as were also the non-Hebrew peoples of pre-Christian times, obligated to conform to whatever other laws God may have revealed to them as individuals or as groups, as in the case of the family of Noah, but they are especially to be judged by the law of their moral nature written in their hearts.

But no revealed law can be an absolute standard of judgment, because of human limitations. The mere possession of a copy of the Bible can not make one amenable to its absolute standard of conduct. The person may lack opportunity to study it or to hear it expounded thoroughly, or he may lack intellectual capacity fully to comprehend its principles and precepts. Also he may lack opportunity to do or to refrain from doing what it enjoins. The standard by which men will be justified or condemned in the final judgment is identical with that standard by which their consciences approve or disapprove acts in this life. That standard accords with the Word of God only to the extent one has knowledge of that Word, and it is variable as a

consequence of one's learning more of the will of God or what one supposes is the will of God. It is not determined by what the individual wishes to believe, but by what he does understand to be the will of God. Therefore God will approve or condemn men at the final judgment as their consciences approve or condemn them. They will be judged according to their hearts' attitude and the motive for their acts in this life rather than according to the conformity or lack of conformity of the acts with any external standard.

But a special element, the grace of Christ, will furnish a ground of judgment for those who have trusted in it for the pardon of past sins. Though conscience condemned them for violation of its recognized standard of right, yet God will approve them in the final judgment. But the merits of Christ will be a ground of judgment only for those who trust in him. All others will be judged in accordance with that standard which binds their individual consciences.

IV. End of the World

By the end of the world is meant the destruction or future conflagration of the earth. The disposition which shall be made of the earth after the close of the earthly history of the human race is of no theological importance and is only of speculative interest.

1. **Truth of the Destruction of the Earth.**—The following are some of the passages of Scripture setting forth the destruction of the earth. "Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure: yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed" (Psa. 102:25, 26). "The heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment" (Isa. 51:6). "Heaven and earth shall pass away" (Matt. 24:35; Mark 13:31; Luke 21:33). "The world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens and earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. . . . The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth

also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. . . . Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. 3:6-13). "I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them" (Rev. 20:11). "I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea" (Rev. 21:1).

Even though some of these texts could be interpreted as referring to great revolutions in church and state, yet evidently that by Peter must be understood literally. He places the earth's future destruction by fire in distinct antithesis with its former destruction by water. As the one was a literal destruction by literal water, so the other will be a literal destruction by literal fire. With this evidence that this text represents a literal destruction of the earth, the fact so established becomes proper ground for the literal interpretation of other texts teaching a destruction of the earth.

The Scripture truth of a future destruction of the earth is in no way contradictory to science. According to the statements of the Scriptures matter has had a beginning in time, a truth with which science is not inharmonious. Therefore it may have an end, especially as to its orderly forms, which even scientists affirm have had a beginning. The universe was once a shapeless mass. Some scientists assume it was in a gaseous state. It is continually undergoing both physical and chemical change. A return of it to its primitive condition is not improbable even apart from anything the Scriptures state.

The time of the destruction of the earth is to be when Christ comes again (2 Pet. 3:4, 10), and at "the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" (v. 7).

2. **Extent of the Destruction of the Earth.**—The earth is to be "burned up." But this is not saying the matter of which it is composed shall cease to exist. Combustion produces a chemical change in matter, but the matter continues to exist in the form of ashes and gases. When the earth was formerly destroyed by water its materials did not cease to exist. It may be reasoned by analogy that its destruction by fire, which is described as an analogous event, does not mean annihilation. The earth and heavens are to "pass away." This expression might be under-

stood to mean annihilation, but not necessarily. Many material things are said to pass away that are only destroyed as to their physical or chemical form. There is no proof either in the Scriptures or in experience that any substance which God created has ever been annihilated.

However, the Scriptures may without violence be interpreted to mean that the earth will be annihilated. If the natural law of the indestructibility of matter be appealed to, it may be replied that in the destruction of the earth natural law will be transcended. Certainly he who created matter is well able to cause it to cease to exist if he so chooses. Whether the destruction of the earth is an annihilation of its substance or only a destruction of its orderly forms is probably not revealed and is therefore unknowable by us. Not a few of the church fathers and reformers did not understand the destruction of the earth to mean the annihilation of its matter.

Another question in connection with the extent of the destruction to follow the judgment is whether the whole material universe will pass away. The heaven and the earth are to pass away. The term "heaven" may include the material universe or it may include merely what pertains to our earth. With the geocentric view of the universe anciently held, the expression would most naturally be understood to include all the heavenly bodies. But with the modern view of the universe in which the earth forms but a mere speck, it is more consistent to refer the destruction to the earth and what relates to it only. Thoughtful minds find difficulty in believing the whole vast physical universe was created merely to furnish a place for man's probation, and that when that short period is ended it will all be destroyed.

Evidently we do well not to be very dogmatic concerning an event for the knowledge of which we are entirely dependent upon Scripture prophecy, and which, as already shown, is not intended to give full information as to the nature of events. The past fulfilments of Scripture prophecies have often been very different from what men were led to expect by a literal interpretation. In other instances such prophecies have been literally fulfilled in minute detail. Doubtless we can not be certain as to the details of the destruction of the earth, but of the reality of the event there need be no question.

Chapter IV

THE FINAL DISPENSATION

The logical culmination of true Christian theology is the doctrine of future retribution. Future punishment of the wicked and reward of the righteous are implied in many of the doctrinal truths already discussed. They are implied in the justice of God, the moral nature of man, his probation, the atonement of Christ, the offer of salvation, the duty of the church to propagate the gospel, future existence, the second coming of Christ, and the final judgment. If all these are true, the doctrine of future reward and punishment must be true. But more direct and specific evidences of future retribution are available.

I. Future Punishment

1. **Proofs of Future Punishment.**—To shrink from the idea of future punishment because of its fearful character is human. But to deny the reality of future punishment because of the awfulness is as unreasonable as to shut one's eyes to the realities of sin, oppression, pain, and misery of this world because of their terribleness. The moral excellence of men here requires that they have in view the solemn truth of punishment hereafter. The doctrine of future punishment is supported by both Scriptural and rational proofs.

The Scriptures represent the punishment of the wicked as taking place after the close of this life. "The rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments" (Luke 16:22, 23). The wicked will be punished when Christ comes again. "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works" (Matt. 16:27). "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints" (2 Thess. 1:7-10). The future punishment of the wicked will be coincident with the blessedness of the righteous.

The wicked will be punished after the general resurrection. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall

awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt'' (Dan. 12:2). ''The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation'' (John 5:28, 29).

The wicked will be punished after the final judgment. ''Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels''(Matt. 25:41). ''And these shall go away into everlasting punishment'' (v. 46). ''For as many as have sinned without the law shall perish without law . . . in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel'' (Rom. 2:12, 16). The wicked will be punished after the destruction of the earth. ''The harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. . . . The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth'' (Matt. 13:39-42). ''But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men'' (2 Pet. 3:7).

Reason also furnishes conclusive evidence that punishment awaits the wicked beyond this life, for which reason not uncommonly have non-Christian religions strongly supported the doctrine of future punishment. Government implies law, and law implies the infliction of penalty for its violation. The truth of a divine moral government is shown by man's inherent sense of moral obligation. The fact of divine government, in the light of God's perfect holiness, implies, not only an exact rewarding of righteousness, but also a punishment of sin in exact proportion to the degree of its sinfulness. If justice is not thus perfectly executed in the world, then it must be done in the future life.

That men are not rewarded or punished in this life according to their deserts must be evident to any observing mind. Frequently the righteous spend their lives in suffering and poverty while the wicked man lives and dies in health and prosper-

ity. Punishment may be suffered only in three modes—in body, in mind, and in estate.

As to physical suffering, it is usually of the nature of legal penalties or by visitation of God. Civil government often fails for various reasons to bring the violator of its laws to justice. Because of human limitations its inflictions are not always according to exact justice. Innocent men are sometimes imprisoned or executed. Many sins, such as blasphemy, are of such a nature that their perpetrators are not amenable to the civil law and therefore are not punished by it. Divinely inflicted physical suffering is evidently many times not of a penal nature, and certainly men are not diseased or injured physically according to their deserts. Some of the most godly persons are diseased and are caused to suffer greatly throughout life. Men's moral character can not be known by the state of their physical health. Very wicked men sometimes live many years, without ever knowing disease or physical pain.

Doubtless sin brings a measure of mental suffering in this life, but often that is not in proportion to the degree of guilt. One person may feel greater remorse because of stealing a dime than would the train-robber who steals a million dollars and kills the train crew. Present remorse for sin can not be the full measure, nor even any considerable part, of the just penalty for sin. This is evident from the fact that a man with a tender conscience who commits but one sin feels great remorse, while another whose conscience is hardened persists in the most heinous sins throughout life with little if any feeling of remorse. Usually the more one sins the less remorse he feels.

Neither can men's characters be known by the amount of their earthly possessions. It is true poverty may sometimes overtake one as a consequence of one's sins. But frequently evil men prosper in material possessions as did Dives, while the righteous, like the beggar Lazarus, live and die in poverty. Doubtless exact justice is not meted out to individuals according to their deserts in this world. To reward and punish men here in such a sense that every sin would immediately bring the exact reward or punishment it deserves would be incongruous with present probation and subversive of it in a considerable measure. Because full and exact justice is not executed in this life,

the truth of the perfect divine government requires the punishment of sin hereafter.

2. **Nature of Future Punishment.**—The future punishments of the wicked are represented as being by "everlasting fire" (Matt. 25:41), by their being cast into a lake of "fire and brimstone" (Rev. 21:8) or a "furnace of fire" (Matt. 13:42), into "outer darkness" (Matt. 8:12), or into "blackness of darkness" (Jude 13), as "no rest day nor night" (Rev. 14:11), as the "second death" (Rev. 21:8), and as "eternal destruction from the face of the Lord" (2 Thess. 1:9, A. S. V.).

The question which now arises is, Are these literal descriptions indicating the actual form of punishment of the wicked or are they figurative? To regard them as being figurative expressions is not to deny the reality of future punishment. There is no more reason to suppose the fire of hell is literal than to suppose heaven has streets paved with literal gold. There appears to be no more ground for assuming the fire of future punishment is literal fire than for supposing the worm which does not die is a literal worm. The purpose of the Scripture expressions is to represent the awfulness of future punishment. A comparison of the different representations show that they can not be literal, because some of them are mutually exclusive of each other. Darkness and fire can not be coexistent, for the nature of fire is to dispel darkness; neither can that punishment be literal death or cessation of being and yet be "no rest." The idea of eternal destruction is likewise not literally consistent with itself.

Future punishment is to be regarded in three aspects: (1) the loss of infinite good; (2) the suffering naturally resulting from sin; and (3) positive penal infliction. The loss of good includes the loss of all the good things of the present life, exclusion from the presence of God and the possibility of his spiritual blessings now possible, the withdrawal of the Spirit of God, through whose agency alone salvation is possible, consequent utter reprobation and hopelessness of all good, and especially the loss of the eternal blessedness of heaven. If future punishment consisted only in this loss it would be infinite. But it also includes positive suffering. The finally lost will be the slave of his unrestrained sinful passions, will be tormented by the malignity and selfishness of evil associates totally abandoned

to wickedness, will suffer the remorse of a guilty conscience, and will be tormented by endless despair.

Not a few persons assume that the natural consequence of sin is the full measure of future punishment. Such a view might be harmonized with the Scriptures, but it seems more in harmony with the representations of that punishment as set forth in the Scriptures to regard it as including positive penal inflictions also. Whatever these are they are not physical torments, for the fire of hell is prepared for the punishment of the devil and his angels, who have no physical bodies. This is another reason why it can not be literal fire. Doubtless we can not know the exact nature of the positive future punishment for sin; therefore should not be dogmatic, but should leave it to be determined by a just God at the proper time. The repulsive overstatements of Christian apologists have too often resulted in the revulsion of many from the whole idea of future punishment.

Future punishment, though infinite in duration, is not infinite in degree nor is it infinite at any particular time. Endlessness of future punishment does not in any sense require that it be infinite in intensity, as the endlessness of the line of the circumference of a circle does not mean it is infinite in breadth. That future punishment is not infinite in intensity is certain from the Scriptural teaching of degrees of punishment. The degree of one's guilt is determinative of the degree of one's punishment. Likewise the degree of the individual's guilt is determined by the degree of his understanding of the divine requirements. "That servant, which knew his lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes" (Luke 12:47, 48). Jesus said of Capernaum, "It shall be *more tolerable* for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee" (Matt. 11:24).

Future punishment will consist in conscious suffering, not in annihilation. We have previously shown that immortality is not a gift of divine grace through Christ and conditional on faith in him, therefore peculiar to believers. This theory of conditional immortality looks for support to those texts of Scripture which represent future punishment as eternal death and everlasting destruction. These texts have already been explained

to mean, not cessation of conscious being, but rather a wretched and impoverished state of being. The idea of annihilation of the wicked at death is incompatible with that of everlasting punishment and especially with those references to the worm that "dieth not" and the smoke of torment ascending forever. The theory of the extinction of being as constituting the future punishment of the wicked is excluded by the truth of degrees of punishment. If punishment were annihilation at death all would suffer alike and degrees of suffering would be excluded.

According to one form of the annihilation theory, the powers of the wicked are gradually weakened because of sin until they finally cease to be. This assumes that sin is necessarily destructive of intellectual powers, which is not according to experience. Men's moral characters can not be judged by the degree of their intellectuality. Some of the world's brightest intellects have led vicious lives. Also if this theory were true then the greater one's sin the quicker he would be freed from punishment.

Another view of annihilation assumes that the wicked will not be annihilated at death, but will first suffer according to their deserts and then be annihilated. In separating the punishment from annihilation this theory denies endless punishment and therefore is unscriptural.

3. **Place of Future Punishment.**—The Scriptures represent the future punishment of the wicked as being in a place which is called "hell" in the common English Bible. In the Revised Version the original Hebrew word *sheol* and the Greek terms ἅδης (*hades*) and γέ-εννα (*gehenna*) are usually retained either in the text or the margin. The theory that these terms refer merely to the grave or to the valley of the Son of Hinnom outside Jerusalem is too unscholarly to deserve any extended notice or serious refutation. A casual reading of the Scriptures affords abundant disproof of it. The inspired writers employed these figures and such words as their language afforded to designate the place of the eternal abode of the wicked.

Though spirits are immaterial, they are capable of localization. Human spirits in this life are localized in physical bodies. Demon spirits are likewise localized in the bodies of demoniacs. Even disembodied spirits must dwell in some place. As certainly as the righteous will enjoy blessedness in a place called

heaven, so the wicked will be punished in a place we call hell. Doubtless hell is a condition, but it is also a place. The wicked shall be turned or cast into it (Psa. 9:17; Matt. 10:28; Mark 9:45).

Hell as a place must correspond to the condition of those who go there. It is represented as being a place of fire, of outer darkness, and an abyss, but as already shown, these are but figures. We can not look beyond the figures by which inspiration has been pleased to represent it to us. To attempt a description of its actual nature would be but speculation. Yet it is certainly a literal place as is heaven.

As to its location we are not informed by the Scriptures and can not know otherwise. The Bible represents heaven as being up and hell as being down. That heaven is away from this earth is evident from the fact that Jesus went up or away from it at the ascension. Hell is doubtless best thought of as away from the earth. It is represented by the Scriptures as being down, in accommodation to the ancient theory that the earth is flat and in conformity with the prevalent Jewish and pagan conceptions of the location of the place of the spirits of the dead.

3. **Duration of Future Punishment.**—The duration of the punishment of the wicked is represented in the Scriptures by the expressions "everlasting punishment" (Matt. 25:46), "everlasting fire" (v. 41), and "everlasting destruction" (2 Thess. 1:9). The words αἰών (*aion*) and αἰώνιος (*aionios*) rendered "everlasting" in these texts and eternal elsewhere are sometimes said not to mean endless duration. We allow they are sometimes used to express merely a very long period, or the greatest duration possible to the subject to which they are applied. But though they do not etymologically necessitate endless duration, yet this is their true sense, and so are they used in the Scriptures. Because they express the longest possible duration of the subject to which they are applied, when they are applied to the immortal soul they mean endless duration. No words afforded by the Greek language express the idea of endless duration when applied to the punishment of the wicked if these do not. They are used to express the endless duration of God (1 Tim. 1:17), of Christ (Heb. 13:8), and of the Holy Spirit (Heb. 9:14). Doubtless in these connections they are

properly understood to mean eternal duration. They are also employed to express the duration of the future blessedness of the righteous. If the happiness in the future life is endless the punishment of sinners there is also of endless duration.

Other Biblical statements also clearly imply eternal punishment for the wicked. The fire of hell is described as "unquenchable" (Luke 3:17), and as "the fire that never shall be quenched" (Mark 9:45). These statements can only mean that the punishment of the wicked never ends. This is certain from the added expression "where their worm dieth not" (v. 48). The endlessness of future punishment is also implied in the statement of Jesus that between the rich man and Lazarus was fixed an impassable gulf. Also it is implied in the teaching that it had been better for the sinner if he had never been born. If after a period of suffering, however long, an eternity of blessedness awaits the wicked, then their being born is, after all, a blessing of inestimable value.

That the Scriptures teach endless punishment of the wicked is evinced by the unanimity with which Christians in all ages have so believed. This doctrine has been stedfastly held by the Greek and Roman Churches and by all great historical Protestant bodies. The most notable modern theological writers unite in support of it. This can be accounted for only on the ground that the doctrine is unmistakably clear in the Scriptures. Certainly Christians do not believe this doctrine because of any hard-heartedness or wish that any of their fellow beings should so suffer.

Men shrink from the idea of eternal punishment. That generous souls should do so is but natural. It is not evidence that they love sin or are enemies of righteousness. That God has similar feelings seems probable from the many expressions of yearning, entreaty, and warning which indicate his reluctance to punish sinners. But such feelings are also experienced by many relative to the infliction of penalty by civil or other human governments. If the infliction of penalty is to be determined by such feelings all government must be subverted.

We who are ourselves the subjects of the divine government, and whose knowledge of the conditions and requirements of the moral universe is so limited, are not qualified to judge independently of the Scriptures as to what is the just penalty of

sin. Much of perplexity exists in regard to government in all its human forms. Not only is this true in determining the penalties for violation of civil law, but even in the government of a family of little children most parents find much perplexity relative to punishment for wrong-doing. Surely if in these things government is a problem to us, we are not qualified to instruct God concerning the conduct of the moral universe. A fact of much significance in this connection is that the Scriptures are thoroughly self-consistent in representing both the sacrifice of Christ in atonement for sin and the future punishment for sin from which that sacrifice is intended to save as being equally infinite. According to both, God regards sin as being of infinite demerit.

Possibly a rational justification of eternal punishment is impossible because of the limitations of human knowledge. Thomas Aquinas and some others have reasoned that because sin is committed against an infinite being, therefore it must be of infinite demerit. In our opinion this theory fails of its purpose because it equalizes all sins, while the Scriptures make the degree of their sinfulness to depend upon the degree of the understanding of the will of God by him who sins. The correct measure of sin is subjective, not external. Instead of the principle of Aquinas here stated, we might as well reason that because he who sins is finite, therefore no sin he may commit can have more than finite demerit.

Again it is reasoned that the atonement is limited to this life; therefore because salvation is not offered in the future life, punishment must be endless. It might as well be reasoned that because no salvation from the penalty of the civil law is offered to the bank-robber, he must therefore be punished forever in this world. Neither the bank-robber in this world nor the sinner in the future life may be justly punished except as he has demerit. The just duration of punishment is not determined by the offer of grace, but by the extent of one's guilt. The explanation here suggested in justification of endless punishment fails to explain.

A more satisfactory rational justification of eternal punishment is that the moral responsibility of men does not end with this life, but that they become confirmed in wickedness, therefore sin eternally, and consequently deserve to be punished

eternally. This makes future punishment to be, not for the sins of this life merely, but for future sinning also. The sins of the present life are the ground only for the beginning of the endless punishment of the future. It is true that the Scriptures do not represent future punishment as being for other than the sins of this life. This may be due, however, to the practical aim of the Scriptures to warn men against persisting in sin here. Yet no rational evidence exists that the lost are morally responsible and still that all are confirmed in sinning so they will always continue to sin. If, however, it be assumed that they are so conditioned that they can not cease from sin because of a lack of power, then their sinning is of necessity and ceases to have demerit.

Like some other great Christian truths, everlasting punishment, though not contradictory to reason, can not be proved by reason. But, as already shown, it is unmistakably a truth of the Scriptures, and because of this is consistently believed by Christians. A proper preaching of this doctrine is not a hindrance to the progress of Christianity, but is important as a warning to men. Though not the highest motive for the renunciation of sin, yet the fear of punishment is a proper motive, and multitudes who have forsaken sin for this reason have later come to serve God because of supreme love to him. A hard, feelingless preaching of everlasting torment may repel sinners, but a solemn warning against it by one moved by divine love has been and still is effective in awakening and saving men. No exaggeration of physical torments is to be favored, yet the doctrine may properly be presented in Biblical figures even without ordinarily stopping to explain they are such.

II. Future Blessedness

1. **The Truth of Future Blessedness.**—A happy existence awaits the righteous beyond this life as surely as punishment awaits the wicked. This is a truth of both the Scriptures and reason. In the Scriptures it is represented as being "eternal life" (Matt. 25:46), an "eternal weight of glory" (2 Cor. 4:17), knowledge (1 Cor. 13:8-10), worship (Rev. 19:1), association with holy men and angels (Heb. 12:23), and as communion with God (Rev. 21:3). Future reward is constantly represented in the Bible as the portion of those who faithfully

endure present testing. From the divine justice, goodness, and fatherhood we properly reason that rewards await the righteous. The righteous do not get just reward of their goodness here, but many of them suffer much instead while spending their lives for the glory of God and the benefit of their fellow men. Surely God will not leave such goodness unrewarded. Future reward for righteousness is implied in the idea of present probation. Though the righteous deserve a measure of reward, yet their blessedness hereafter is to be thought of as being largely through God's grace through Christ.

2. **The Place of Future Blessedness.**—Future blessedness is to be experienced in heaven. Heaven is certainly a condition, but it is also a place. It is a material place, for only a material place may be the abode of material bodies, which the resurrected bodies of the righteous have been already shown to be. Also the resurrected body of Jesus which ascended to heaven was a material body. The heaven in which these beings with material bodies dwell can not be merely infinite space. The righteous are not to spend eternity in solitude, but will be associated together and be with God and the angels. To affirm that heaven is a material place is not, however, to say it is gross material such as we now know subject to change and disintegration. It may be of glorified, incorruptible material similar in nature to that of our resurrected bodies. But even disembodied spirits may be localized. In this life men's spirits are localized in their bodies. Demon spirits and the Holy Spirit are sometimes so localized. The spirit of the dying thief on the cross Jesus said was to go to paradise. The angels and God are localized, in that heaven is their abode. The Scriptures represent heaven as a place under the figures of a house, a mansion, a city, and a new earth.

We can not know the location of heaven, except that it is somewhere away from this earth. Not a few have assumed that it will be located on this earth. Such suppose the new heavens and new earth will be constructed from the materials of this earth after its future destruction. Such a view can not be supported by the Scriptures. They rather represent it as now existing elsewhere. God and the angels now dwell there. Jesus ascended to heaven in the sight of his apostles, and "gazing upward," they watched him go. The righteous "depart" to be

with Christ. When Jesus was about to go to heaven he told his disciples he was going away to prepare a place for them and that he would come again and receive them to that place, that they might be with him. The place is to be prepared before Christ comes again; therefore this earth can not be that place.

3. **The Nature of Future Blessedness.**—The happiness of the righteous in heaven will consist in various elements. (1) They will be secure from the possibility of being forever lost. (2) They will be free forever from all earthly sorrow and pain. "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain" (Rev. 21:4). They shall no longer be tempted by sin, nor troubled by sinful surroundings. (3) They shall then know God as they are now known of him. "They shall see his face," and "see him as he is." If present experiences of the glory and love of God give joy unspeakable and full of glory, what must the bliss of heaven be! If here where they "see through a glass darkly," communion with God is indescribably satisfying, what "bliss beyond compare" will the joys of heaven be when they abide forever in God's holy presence! They shall then praise and worship him perfectly. (4) Also the righteous shall there have happy intercourse and joyful fellowship with holy angels, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and all the holy and truly great. If holy fellowships in this life afford great pleasure, eternity in such society will be heaven indeed. (5) Still another element of future blessedness will be the opportunity for indefinite enlargement of all faculties. We may well believe the righteous will live and learn forever there.

What all the other elements of future blessedness will consist of we may not know, but doubtless the beauty of the place will add much to it. The beauty of heaven is represented to us in the Scriptures in figures. The most beautiful things imaginable are employed to represent it. It is represented as a beautiful garden through which flows a "pure river of water of life, clear as crystal." On each side of the river grows "the tree of life" bearing twelve kinds of fruit each month. Heaven is also represented as being a beautiful house, a mansion which Jesus has gone to prepare and in which he will dwell with his people. It is also represented as a wonderful city, walled according to the ideal of cities anciently, with foundations of the

most precious stones, walls of jasper, and gates of pearl, while the streets and city are of "pure gold, like unto clear glass." Heaven is also represented as "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. 3:13).

What the reality is which these wonderful figures represent is probably beyond the capacity of our finite minds to comprehend even if it were literally described. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him" (1 Cor. 2:9).

INDEX

Page

A

Abiogenesis 83
Adoption 432
Advent, Christ's second 633
Alford, Dean, bishop and presbyter 525
Mode of baptism 562
Angelology 262
Angels 262
Existence and nature of angels 262
Good angels 264
Evil angels 265
Animistic superstition not the source of the idea of God 48
Anointing with oil 498
Anthon, baptism 558
Anthropological Argument for theism 65
Argument from man's intelligence 66
Argument from man's freedom 67
Argument from man's moral nature 67
Argument from man's religious nature 68
Anthropology 273
Antichrist, no personal 629
Antiquity of man 274
Antitheistic theories 71
Apollonarians 367
Apologetics, Christian 93
Definition of 93
Importance of 93
History of 96
Present-day task of 96
Nature and classification of evidences 97
Apostasy and restoration of the church 536
Two aspects of apostasy predicted 536
Lutheran reformation partial 544
A partial return to the Bible 544
Human ecclesiasticism continued 545
Protestant divisions 546
A complete restoration 549
A priori argument for theism 69
Arione 367
Arminian theory of sin 341
Assurance of salvation 433
Fact of assurance 433
Nature of assurance 434
Witness of God's Spirit 435
Witness of our spirits 437
Assurance in relation to doubts 438
Athanasian Creed 209
Athanasius 209
Atheism 71
Sense of 71
Unreasonableness of 71
Possibility of 72
Atonement of Christ 371
Sense of atonement 371
Fact and doctrine of atonement 372
Theories of pardon without atonement 374
Biblical statements about atonement 377
Atonement in the Old Testament sacrifices 387
Elements in the doctrine of atonement 390
Attributes of God 179
Nature and classification of God's attributes 181
Relation of God's attributes to his essence 182
Classes of attributes 183
Augustinian theory of sin 340
Augustine, foot-washing 583

B

Baptism, Water 557
Mode of baptizing 557
The original word 558
Prepositions used with "baptize" 559
Circumstances for baptizing 560
History of the mode 563
Practise of the Eastern churches 565
Evidence of the baptisteries 565
Objections to immersion considered 565
Sprinkling and pouring 567
Trine immersion 569
Subjects for baptism 570
Purpose of baptism 574
Essentials of baptism 575
Baptism with the Holy Spirit 466
Expressions representative of it 466
A definite experience 467
Distinct from regeneration .. 468
Results of the baptism with the Spirit 470

	Page
One baptism but many fillings	471
Benefits of the atonement	393
Unconditional benefits	393
Conditional benefits	398
Biblical theology	27
Birth, New	423
Bishops	523
Blessedness, Future	660
Truth of future blessedness	660
Place of future blessedness	661
Nature of future blessedness	662
Body, Resurrection of the	639
Born again	423
Brenner, baptism	564
Butler, Joseph	96

C

	Page
Calvinistic predestination	406
Causation, Law of	53
Chalcedon, Creed of	357
Chalmers, theory of creation	238
Charismata	473
Christ, Divinity of	215
Called God	216
Called Jehovah	218
Eternal	219
Immutable	220
Omnipresent	220
Omniscient	221
Omnipotent	222
Creator	222
Judge of men	223
Worship accepted by him	223
Christ, Offices of	371
Christ, Person of	355
Doctrine of Christ's person	355
Two natures in Christ	358
Two natures in one person	362
Christological errors	366
Christ, Predictions concerning	137
Christian Evidences	93
Nature and classification	97
Probable not demonstrative	97
Rational and authenticating	98
Main classes of	98
Presumptive evidences	99
Christological errors	366
Christology	355
Factors of the doctrine	356
Creedal statements	356
Christ's second advent	633
Church, The	507
Organization of the Church	507
Sense of the term	507
Universal church	508
Local church	509
Relation to God's kingdom	509
Time of the church's organization	510
Figures representing the church	513
Nature of its organization	513
Different forms of church organization	513
The church divinely organized	514
Human agencies in its organization	516
Organization of operative agencies	518
Church, Government of the	521
Officers of the church	521
Divine and human aspects of church government	528
Nature of ministerial authority	530
Number and choice of church officers	531
Clarke, W. N., Christ's second coming	635
Definition of God	182
Coleman, baptism	565
Collateral evidences of Christianity	153
Effects of Christianity on society	160
Rapid spread of Christianity	163
Communion Supper	576
Conditional benefits of the atonement	398
Salvation from sin conditional	398
Special providence through prayer	400
Future blessedness	400
Conditionality of salvation	398
Conn on embryology and evolution	250
On origin of species	250
Conscience	300
Discriminating function	301
Impulsive power	302
Retributive aspect	304
Constantinopolitan Creed	229
Consubstantiation	580
Conybeare and Howson, bishops and presbyters	525
Cope, E. D., on evolution	244
Cosmological argument for theism	52
Council of Constantinople	209
Create, Sense of the term	233
Creation and evolution	244
Creation, God's work in	231
Matter created out of nothing	232

	Page
Creative work not necessary to God	234
The Genesis record historical	235
Creative days and geologic periods	237
Agreement of Moses and science	241
Creationism, Theory of	291
Credibility of the New Testament	113
Accepted by those familiar with the events	114
Writers possessed requisites for credibility	115
Creedal statements about Christ	356

D

Dana on the order of creation	242, 243
On evolution	86
Darwin, Charles	78
On origin of species	250
Deacons	526
Death, Life after	595
Definition of theology	125
Demoniacs	268
Demonology	265
Demon possession	268
Demons	265
Devils	265
Depravity, a ground for a twofold cleaning	449
Depravity in the regenerated	450
Depravity, Native	326
Derangement of the moral nature	327
Loss of the Holy Spirit	330
A bent to sin	330
Extent of native depravity	331
Question of total depravity	331
Degree of depravity	332
Proofs of native depravity	333
Depravity of the race	317
Derangement of the moral nature	327
Design argument for theism	56
Objections to	63
Design in nature	59
Dichotomy	283
Dispensation, final	651
Divine physical healing	488
Divine revelation necessary	99
As standard of right	99
For pardon of sin	100
To understand providence and prayer	101
Divine Trinity	205
Divinity of Christ	215
Divine titles	216
Divine attributes	219
Divine works	222
Worship accorded to Christ	223
Divinity of the Holy Spirit	227
Doctrines, Perfect	141
Dogmatic theology	26
Duality of human nature	283

E

Earth, Destruction of the	648
Extent of the destruction of the earth	649
Ebionites	366
Ecclesiasticism, Human	554
Ecclesiology	507
Elders, Plurality of, in local church	531
Election	408
Elements of human nature	283
Dual constitution of man	283
Theory of trichotomy	285
How man is superior to the brute	288
End of the world	648
Engis skull	86
Erroneous sources of theology	32
Errors, Alleged in the Bible	172
Historical	173
Scientific	174
Moral	175
Contradictions	176
Eschatology	595
Ethical attributes of God	183
Eucharist	576
Eutychians	368
Evans, Wm., on inspiration	172
Everlasting punishment	657
Evidences of God's existence	52
Evidences of Divine revelation	93
Evolution, Creation and	244
Evolution not God's method of creation	244
Evolution and the Scriptures irreconcilable	245
Facts reconcilable with progressive creation	248
Objections to the evolution theory	250
Evolution hypothesis	77
Exegetical theology defined	25
Existence of God	43
Rational proofs of	52
Experimental evidences of Christianity	153
Nature of experimental evidences	153
Effects of Christian experience in consciousness	155

Page

Effects of Christian experience on character ... 156
Effects of Christianity at death ... 159
External Evidences of Christianity ... 104

F

Fairhurst on evolution ... 246, 251
Faith, Salvation by ... 414
Fall of the race ... 317
Final perseverance ... 412
First cause argument for theism ... 52
Fisher, G. P., growth of the hierarchy ... 542
Miracles ... 117
Five points differentiating between Calvinists and Arminians ... 406
Foot-washing ... 583
History of foot-washing ... 583
The command of Jesus ... 584
Objections considered ... 586
Significance of foot-washing 590
Foreknowledge of God ... 190
Forgiveness of sin ... 420
Free Agency ... 305
Question of freedom vital to theology ... 305
Leading theories of the will ... 306
Proofs of free will ... 308
Objections to free will answered ... 309
Real freedom ... 312

G

General judgment ... 643
Genetic law mode theory of the transmission of depravity ... 350
Genuineness of the New Testament ... 105
Method of showing it ... 105
Affirmed by the church fathers ... 106
Insured by carefulness in determining the canon ... 108
Early adversaries never denied it ... 110
Geologic periods, Creative days and ... 237
Gift of tongues ... 476
Gifts of the Spirit ... 473
Nature of Charismata ... 473
Not given alike to all ... 474
When spiritual gifts may be received ... 476
Glossolalia ... 477
Gnostics ... 366

Page

God, Definition of ... 182
Attributes of ... 183
God, Existence of ... 43
Origin of our idea of ... 43
Universality of the idea of God ... 45
Necessity of the idea of God 47
Bible assumes the existence of God ... 48
Government, Divine, of the world ... 255
Government of the church ... 521

H

Haeckel ... 83, 84
Hagenbach, baptism ... 564
Hamilton on the knowledge of God ... 179
Hands, Laying on of ... 499
Healing, Divine physical ... 488
Fact of divine healing ... 488
Post apostolic healing ... 489
A present reality ... 490
Reasonableness of divine healing ... 491
Nature of divine healing ... 494
Conditions for healing ... 498
Anointing with oil ... 499
Attitude toward human remedies ... 500
Objections to divine healing 502
Heart, New ... 425
Heaven ... 661
Hell ... 656
Historical theology defined ... 25
Hodge, definition of God ... 182
Early church creeds ... 210
Inspiration ... 170
Representativism ... 347
Holiness of life ... 440
Holy Spirit ... 225
Personality of ... 225
Divinity of ... 227
Procession of ... 228
Human Conditions for Salvation ... 414
Faith in Christ ... 414
Repentance ... 416
Obedience ... 417
Human nature argument for theism ... 65
Hume's argument against miracles ... 119
Huxley, Thomas ... 83, 84

I

Immersion is baptism ... 557
Immortality, Question of ... 293
Man's body created mortal ... 293

Page
The Soul is immortal ... 295
Immortality of the soul ... 595
Rational proofs ... 595
Teaching of the Scriptures ... 598
Theory of conditional immortality ... 601
Incarnation, Divine ... 359
Infant baptism ... 571
Inspiration of the Scriptures ... 167
Fact and nature ... 167
Proof of inspiration ... 167
Theories of inspiration ... 167
True nature of inspiration ... 169
Objections to inspiration ... 172
Integrity of the New Testament ... 111
Evidence from ancient manuscripts ... 111
Corroboration of ancient versions and quotations ... 112
Corruption of the Scriptures not possible ... 113
Intermediate state ... 603
Intermediate place ... 603
Not a state of purgatory ... 604
Not a state of probation ... 605
Internal Christian evidences ... 141
Perfect doctrines ... 141
Perfect adaptation to man's needs ... 144
Perfect morals ... 146
Style and incidental allusions ... 147
Intuition, the source of the knowledge of the Divine existence ... 43
Nature of intuitions in general ... 43

J

Jewish theories of inspiration of the Scriptures ... 168
Jews, their present distribution 136
Predictions concerning the Jews ... 134
Judgment, Final ... 643
Truth of a future judgment ... 643
Nature of the final judgment 645
Object of the final judgment 646
Standards of the final judgment ... 647
Justification ... 419
Sense of the term ... 419
Forgiveness and remission ... 420
Basic for justification ... 421

K

Keith, Arthur, on the Dawn man ... 87
Kenotic Christology ... 368
Kingdom of Christ ... 612
Nature of Christ's kingdom ... 613
Predictions of time of its establishment ... 614
When Christ's kingdom established ... 616
Knowledge of God, Possibility of ... 179
God an object of knowledge 79
Extent of man's knowledge of God ... 180
How God may be known ... 180

L

Languages of the Scriptures ... 149
Laplace ... 77
Last things ... 595
Le Conte, definition of evolution ... 244
Lidgett, J. S., the atonement ... 373
Literary style of the Scriptures ... 149
Lord's Supper ... 576
Lutheran Christology ... 368

M

Main divisions of theological sciences ... 25
Man, Doctrine of ... 273
Man, Original state of ... 296
Primitive man of lofty grade 296
Constituted relatively perfect ... 296
Not a barbarian ... 298
In the Divine image ... 299
Man superior to the brute ... 288
Man's nature, Constituent elements of ... 293
Materialism ... 74
Antitheistic character ... 74
Fruitless attempt to account for thought ... 75
Reasoning from analogy defective ... 75
Matter created out of nothing ... 232
McClintock and Strong, footwashing ... 584
McCurdy, George C., on Dawn man ... 88
Mechanical dictation theory of inspiration ... 168
Metaphysical attributes of God 183
Unity ... 183
Spirituality ... 184
Immutability ... 186
Eternity ... 186
Omnipotence ... 187
Omnipresence ... 189
Omniscience ... 190

	Page
Method of theology	34
Mill on the knowledge of God	179
Millenarianism	608
History of millenarianism	610
Literal or figurative interpretation	617
Historical interpretation	619
Revelation 20:1-6	620
Objections to millenarianism	624
Premillenarian questions	630
Miller, Hugh, on reconstruction theory of creation	239
On creation and science	243
Miracles as Christian evidence	116
Possibility and probability of miracles	117
Miracles provable by testimony	119
Proofs that miracles occurred	120
Evidential value of miracles	127
Counterfeit miracles	128
Modern miracles	128
Mode of the transmission of original sin	339
Theories of original sin	339
Unscriptural theories of transmission of original sin	342
Law of genetic transmission	349
Mohammedan theories of the inspiration of the Koran	168
Monistic aspects of pantheism	73
Moral attributes of God	193
Holiness	194
Justice	196
Love	198
Mercy	202
Truth	203
Moral nature of man, Original	296
Morals, Perfect	146
Mysticism	33

N

	Page
Native depravity	326
Natural inspiration theory	168
Natural theology	26
Naturalistic evolution	77
Difficulties of	81
Fails to account for the fire-mist	81
Fails to account for the origin of life	83
Fails to account for man's body	85
Fails to account for the origin of mind	88
Naturalistic and theistic evolution	79
Nature a source of theology	30
Nature, Evidence of design in	59
Nature and works of God	179
Natures of Christ, Two	358
Neanderthal skull	86
Necessity of the idea of God	47
Nestorians	367
Nevius, J. L., on demon possession	268
New Testament	105
Genuineness	105
Catalogs of books of	106
Integrity	111
Manuscripts	111
Versions	112
Credibility	113
Nicea, Council of	208
Nicene Creed	208

O

	Page
Officers, Classes of church	521
Ordinances of the church	556
Antiordinance arguments considered	557
Ontological Argument	69
Organization of the church	507
Origin of our idea of God	43
Origin of Souls	290
Original moral nature and state of man	296
Original righteousness	313
Nature of original righteousness	313
Proofs of original righteousness	315
Original sin, Nature of	326
Sense of original sin	326
A derangement of the moral nature	327
A loss of the Holy Spirit	330
A bent to sin a result of depravity	330
Mode of transmission of original sin	339

P

	Page
Paley, William	96
Design argument for theism	56
Pantheism	73
Definition of	73
Monistic aspects of	73
Defects of	74
Pardon of sin	420
Pasteur, Louis, spontaneous generation	85
Pastors	523
Pelagian theory of sin	339
Pentecostal movement	481
Perseverance, Absolute final	412
Person of Christ	355

Page

Personality of the Holy Spirit 225
Polytheism 72
Meaning and origin of 72
Different aspects of 73
Possession, Devil 268
Postmillenarianism 608
Pouring as baptism 567
Practical theology defined 26
Prayer and divine providence 259
Predestination 406
The Calvinistic theory 406
Election 408
Preexistence, Theory of 290
Premillenarianism 608
Present reformation 549
Present tendency to unity 549
Complete reformation predicted 551
A return to the Scriptures 553
Rejection of human ecclesiasticism 554
Presumptive Christian evidences 99
Probability of divine revelation 99
Possibility of divine revelation 99
Necessity of divine revelation 99
Marks to be expected are to be found in the Scriptures 101
Probation, original 317
Probation needed for moral excellence 317
Positive probationary law 318
No injustice in Adam's probation 319
Procession of the Holy Spirit 228
Prophecy as Christian Evidence 129
Nature of the argument 129
Objections to the argument 132
Predictions concerning the Jews 134
Predictions concerning Christ 137
Protestant divisions 546
Providence, God's work in 253
Natural providence 254
Supernatural providence 257
Pulpit Commentary, the apostasy 536
Punishment, Future 651
Proofs of future punishment 651
Nature of future punishment 654
Place of future punishment 656
Duration of future punishment 657

Page

Purgatory 604

Q

Qualifications for study of theology 37

R

Rapid spread of Christianity at its beginning 163
Hindrances to its spread 163
Means employed inadequate 164
Rapidity of its spread unparalleled 165
Rationalism 33
Realistic mode theory of the transmission of depravity 343
Reconciliation 371
Sense of reconciliation 371
Redemption, Application of 393
Unconditional benefits of the atonement 393
Conditional benefits of the atonement 398
Reformation of the Sixteenth Century 544
A partial return to the Bible 544
Human ecclesiasticism continued 545
Regeneration 423
Ground of the need 425
Nature and effects 428
Present regeneration 430
Baptismal regeneration 430
Religion and theology 25
Remission of sin 420
Repentance 416
Representative mode theory of the transmission of depravity 347
Resurrection, General 639
Fact of a general resurrection 639
Nature of resurrected bodies 640
The question of identity 642
Resurrection of Christ, Proof of the 125
Revealed theology 26
Revelation the source of theology 31
Righteousness of God 194
Righteousness, Original 313
Robinson, pools for baptizing 567
Roman Catholic traditions 32
Rutter, observance of baptism in third century 540

S

Sacrifices, Reconciliation in Old Testament 387
Animal sacrifices typify Christ 387

Page

Old Testament sacrifices were expiatory ... 388
Salvation, Wrong theories of ... 374
Impossibility of pardon ... 374
Forgiveness by divine prerogative ... 375
Pardon on repentance ... 376
Sanctification, Entire ... 448
Sense of the term ... 448
Need of a second cleansing 449
Distinction between regeneration and sanctification 453
Proofs of a second cleansing 454
For the converted ... 455
For the church ... 456
An entire sanctification ... 457
Coincident with the Holy Spirit baptism ... 457
Two cleansings in types ... 458
Nature of entire sanctification ... 460
Effects of sanctification ... 461
A definite work ... 462
Attainable in this life ... 463
Conditions for sanctification 464
Assurance of sanctification 465
Satan ... 266
Science, Agreement of Moses and ... 241
Scriptures, Inspiration of ... 167
Second cleansing ... 449
Second coming of Christ ... 634
The fact of his coming ... 634
Nature of his coming ... 634
Time of his coming ... 637
Signs of his coming ... 638
Sheldon, conscience ... 301
Divine omnipresence ... 189
Evolution ... 253
Sin, Freedom from ... 440
Sinlessness of life ... 440
Sense of the Scriptures ... 440
Definitive sense of sin ... 442
Why holy living is denied ... 444
Objections considered ... 445
Sin, Origin and nature of ... 319
The first temptation ... 319
Man's fall and its effects ... 322
Nature of sin ... 323
Sin not a divine method ... 325
Original sin, Nature of ... 326
Society, Effects of Christianity on ... 160
The Gospel promotes universal brotherhood ... 161
The Gospel sanctifies domestic relations ... 162
Socinian Christology ... 369
Sonship ... 432

Page

Children of God ... 432
Sonship by adoption ... 432
Sonship by birth ... 432
Soteriology ... 355
Soul, Immortality of the ... 595
Souls, Origin of ... 290
Theory of preexistence ... 290
Theory of creationism ... 291
Theory of traducianism ... 292
Sources of theology ... 30
Spencer, Herbert ... 78
The Knowledge of God ... 179
Watch argument ... 68
Spiritual gifts ... 473
Spontaneous generation of life 83
Sprinkling as baptism ... 567
Strong, inspiration ... 172
Realistic mode theory ... 343
Sully, James, on evolution ... 244
Supper, the Lord's ... 576
A Christian ordinance ... 576
Method of observance ... 577
Purpose of the Supper ... 579
Erroneous views ... 580
Systematic theology defined ... 26
Systematization of theology ... 35

T

Teleological Argument for theism ... 56
Terminology of theology ... 37
Tertullian, foot-washing ... 583
Theism ... 43
Theodicy, Problem of ... 200
Theology, Definition of ... 25
Contents ... 25
Idea of ... 25
Religion and ... 25
Main Divisions of ... 25
Other designating terms used with ... 26
Uses of term as to extent ... 27
Exegetical ... 25
Historical ... 25
Systematic ... 26
Practical ... 26
Natural ... 26
Revealed ... 27
Dogmatic ... 27
Biblical ... 27
Importance of ... 27
Sources of ... 30
Method of ... 34
Qualifications for the study of ... 37
Theology proper ... 179
Thompson, William ... 83
Tongues, Gift of ... 476
Nature of New Testament

Page
glossolalia 477
Purpose of speaking in tongues 478
Postapostolic speaking in tongues 480
Not evidence of Holy Spirit baptism 482
Proper attitude toward tongues 484
Total depravity 331
Tyndall on matter 82, 89
Traducianism, Theory of 292
Transmission of depravity, Mode of the 339
Transubstantiation 580
Tribulation, No great 628
Trichotomy, Theory of 285
Trine immersion 569
Trinity, Divine 205
Biblical elements of the doctrine 206
The doctrine in early church symbols 207
The doctrine stated 210
Mystery of the Trinity 211
Bible proofs of the Trinity 212

U

Unconditional benefits of the atonement 393
Individual existence 393
Possibility of universal salvation 394
Salvation for those dying in infancy 394
Power requisite for probation 396
Unity of the human race 274
Antiquity of the race 274
Race distinctions and unity 277
Physiological argument 279
Psychological argument 281
Philological argument 281
Biblical argument 282
Unity of the Scriptures 148
Universality of opportunity for salvation 401
Christ died for all men 402
Salvation is for all men 403
The gospel is to be preached to all 404
God wills the salvation of all 404
Universality of the idea of God 45
Universe as an effect 55

V

Virgin birth of Christ 361

W

Walker, tendency to unity 549
Washing of feet 583
Westminster Confession, predestination 407
Will, Freedom of the 305
Winchell on creation 243
Witness of the Spirit 433
Works of God 231
World, End of the 648
Wright, George Frederick, on evolution theory 248

INDEX

of

SCRIPTURE TEXT CITED

Chap. Verse	Page
GENESIS	
1:2	228
1:2	231, 233
1:5	241
1:11	350
1:26, 27	300
1:27	273
1:28, 29	294
1:31	296
1:31	315
2:4	241
2:7	294
2:15	294
2:17	318
2:19, 20	297
3:22	294
6:5	333
8:21	333
10:15-18	276
17:1	188
18:2	265
18:4	587
19:2	587
19:5	265
24:32	587
43:24	587
46:18	275
47:9	601
EXODUS	
3:14	187
6:2, 3	219
15:11	194
34:6, 7	203
37:1-9	176
LEVITICUS	
4:2	288
11:44	194
15:31	390
17:11	388
NUMBERS	
14:18	203
16:22	185
DEUTERONOMY	
4:35	184
6:4	184
10:1-5	176
25:1	419
28:47-68	135
32:4	196
33:2	620
JUDGES	
19:21	587
1 SAMUEL	
25:40, 41	587
29:4	382
2 SAMUEL	
11:8	587
1 KINGS	
8:46	446
22:28	140
2 KINGS	
5:14	558
6:5-7	118
NEHEMIAH	
9:6	253
JOB	
14:4	335
14:4	350
14:12	625
15:15	335
38:4-7	263
PSALMS	
8:4, 5	294
8:4-8	294
9:17	657
22:3	194
22:27	631
34:7	265
34:9, 10	258
37:3	258
37:25	258
51:5	333
51:5	350
58:3	334
58:6	175
67:7	631
69:18-25	176
89:14	196
90:2	187
102:25, 26	648
103:8-14	203
111:9	194
113:118	578
139:7	227
139:7-10	190
145:19	258
147:5	193
PROVERBS	
15:3	192
ECCLESIASTES	
3:21	288
7:20	446
7:29	315
8:11	333
12:7	284
12:7	291
ISAIAH	
2:2	631
2:4	631
6:2-4	265
6:3	194
6:9	227
7:14	362
9:6	218, 529
9:6, 7	137
9:6, 7	616
11:9	179, 631
11:6-9	631
21:4	558
35:1	631
35:4-6	489
40:3	219
42:6	631
42:9	193
44:6	184
45:5	184
45:21	196
51:6	648
53:2-12	139
53:4	492
57:15	187
66:20, 23	627
JEREMIAH	
17:9	333
23:5, 6	219
23:6	422
23:23, 24	190
31:31, 33, 34	227
32:17	188

Chap. Verse Page

EZEKIEL
18:32 404
33:11 405
33:15 417
36:25, 26.....425, 568
36:26, 27..... 443
43:19, 20..... 627

DANIEL
2:34, 35..... 552
2:35 615
2:37-44 614
7:10 264
7:15 284
7:26, 27..... 552
9:21 265
9:27 628
9:24 .....169, 240
9:24-27 138
12:2 .....622, 639, 652

HOSEA
6:3 620
6:7 348

JOEL
2:28 483

MICAH
5:2 139
6:7 284

ZECHARIAH
12:1 .....284, 291
14:6, 7.....552, 638

MALACHI
3:1 219
3:6 186

MATTHEW
1:2, 3..... 219
1:11 276
1:16 431
1:18-25 362
1:21 440
1:23 218
2:1 431
3:2 616
3:8, 9..... 570
3:11 .....466, 470
3:17 214
4:23 489
5:23, 24 .....382, 417
5:28 324
6:9 447
6:10 264
6:14, 15 417
6:26-30 253
6:33 .....258, 613
8:11 569
8:12 654
8:16 489
8:16, 17 489
8:17 .....400, 492
8:28 .....268, 269
9:9 169
9:32 269
9:35 489
10:7 468
10:23 635
10:28 ....284, 295, 657
10:30 .....254, 494
11:10 219
11:11 431
11:14 618
11:19 419
11:24 .....643, 655
12:22 269
12:26 246
12:31 228
12:36 644
13:30, 39, 49 644
13:39-42 652
13:42 654
14:33 224
16:16 468
16:17 396
16:18 ....508, 512, 515
16:27 ....630, 644, 651
16:28 635
17:15 269
17:21 270
18:17 530
18:20 221
19:13-15 571
19:14 395
19:17 446
19:26 .....188, 217
20:28 ....377, 379, 380
20:22, 23 561
21:2, 3 131
21:22 493
22:30 263
22:32 598
23:13 614
23:26 335
23:37 405
24:3 638
24:11, 12 540
24:14 638
24:21 628
24:27 634
24:30 635
24:34 636
24:35 648
24:36 637
24:37-39 637
25:31 630
25:31, 32 639
25:31-46 ..223, 643, 645
25:41 .....652, 654
25:46 374, 657, 660, 561
26:25-30 576
26:26 619
26:26, 28 581
26:30 578
26:64 635
28:18-20 221
28:19 .....213, 557, 569
28:30 586

MARK
1:5 560
1:9 560
1:14, 15 616
1:15 416
3:14 515
5:1 268
5:7, 8 481
6:12, 13 499
7:13 167
7:21-23 334
8:36 288
9:1 617
9:18 269
9:21 269
9:25 269
9:26 269
9:45 .....657, 658
11:24 .....260, 493, 499
12:25 263
13:31 648
13:32 222
14:22-26 576
16:15, 16 404
16:16 .....399, 398, 605
16:18 .....493, 500

LUKE
1:11 265
1:26 431
1:32, 33 616
1:35 362
2:9 265
3:17 658
5:20-24 223
6:43-45 .....315, 335
7:22 125
9:26 569
10:13 465
10:20 468
10:21 358
10:27 .....287, 288

Chap. Verse Page

11:4 447
11:11 380
11:13 400
12:12 227
12:47, 48 655
12:50 561
15:21 416
16:15 419
16:16 ..... 614, 616
16:22, 23 ..... 599, 651
17:20, 21 613
18:13 416
20:35, 36 294
20:35, 36 ..... 263, 641
20:38 599
21:24 137
21:33 648
22:19 577
22:19, 20 576
23:43 599
24:39 ..... 294, 358
24:44 246
24:49 467

JOHN

1:1, 2 220
1:1-3 ..... 216, 220, 222
1:1-3, 14 359
1:9 ..... 396, 416
1:10 222
1:12, 13 ..... 433, 468
1:17 171
1:29 388
1:45 246
3:3 336
3:3, 5, 7 424
3:5 ..... 227, 510, 614
3:13 221
3:14, 15 377
3:15 602
3:16 ..... 199, 399
3:16, 17 403
3:16, 18, 36 605
3:18 ..... 399, 574
3:36 ..... 414, 602
4:24 185
5:14 440
5:22 ..... 223, 646
5:23 224
5:24, 25 624
5:27 223
5:28, 29 ..... 622, 625, 630 639, 644, 652
5:40 405
5:46, 47 246
6:26 625
6:39, 40, 44, 54 639
6:44 396

Chap. Verse Page

6:53 581
8:11 440
8:34, 36 441
8:36 613
8:44 321
8:58 219
9:38 224
10:15 221
10:27, 28 602
10:27-29 413
10:35 167
11:50 380
12:48 647
13:2-17 ..... 584, 585
13:13-16 590
14:3 634
14:6 386
14:13 ..... 227, 493
14:16 227
14:17 ..... 457, 468, 469
14:18 635
14:26 207
15:1-6 463
15:2 413
15:3 468
15:7 493
15:19 ..... 403, 410, 468
15:26 ..... 226, 229
16:13 ..... 214, 227
16:13, 14 226
16:21 431
16:23 493
16:30 221
17:5 207
17:6 468
17:8 468
17:12 413
17:17 458
17:20, 21 548
20:28 217
21:17 221

ACTS

1:5 ..... 466, 468, 471
1:11 635
1:16 176
1:20 176
1:22, 23 521
1:24 521
2:1-13 477
2:3 470
2:4 466, 471, 478, 482
2:6, 8 476
2:38 399, 416, 557, 467 570, 574
2:38, 39 571
2:39 465
2:46 578

Chap. Verse Page

3:19 ..... 416, 425
4:8 471
4:12 386
4:23 512
4:31 471
5:3 227
5:3, 4 227
6:5 512
7:38 508
7:55 224
7:59, 60 224
8:1 509
8:5-17 458
8:12 ..... 469, 570
8:15, 17 464
8:16 ..... 557, 570
9:11 458
9:31 509
10:2, 22 458
10:44, 45 467
10:45 482
10:44-46 477
10:47, 48 557
10:48 570
11:15, 16 468
11:15, 17 467
11:24 446
11:28 522
13:2 226
13:2-4 ..... 226, 529
13:9 472
13:39 574
13:47 631
14:11-18 479
14:23 534
15:2 518
15:6 532
15:8, 9 458
16:15 572
16:16 268
16:31 ..... 399, 414
16:32, 34 560
17:26 ..... 278, 282, 292
17:28 190
17:29 181
17:31 ..... 637, 643
18:8 570
19:16 458
19:2 469
19:2-6 467
19:5 570
19:6 ..... 464, 477, 482
19:14 270
19:32, 39 508
20:7 ..... 512, 577, 579
20:17 ..... 512, 524, 532
20:28 ..... 218, 368, 383 525, 548

Chap. Verse	Page
21:8	522
21:11	522
22:16	557, 574
24:15	626, 639
26:13-18	574
26:18	400, 458
26:23	625
28:25	227

ROMANS

1:1	171
1:2-5	361
1:16	399
1:19, 20	397
1:28	179
2:12	606, 647
2:12, 16	652
2:13	419
2:14, 15	397
2:28, 29	618
3:9, 10	335
3:10	426
3:10, 23	445
3:20	335
3:23	426, 427
3:24	383
3:24-26	385
3:25	381
3:28	417
4:5	399
4:11, 16	618
4:15	443
4:17	233
5:1	414, 437
5:8	199, 377, 379
5:11	371, 381
5:12 278, 283, 291,	349
5:5, 18	403
5:19	274, 422
6:4	575
6:12	294
6:12, 14, 17, 18, 22,	441
6:23	322, 602
7:9 322, 323, 334,	602
7:14-25	447
7:18	426
7:23	429
8:2	336, 429
8:9	230, 469
8:11	294
8:14	432
8:15	432
8:16	227, 434, 437
8:26	227
8:29, 30	410

ROMANS

9:5	218, 361
9:6	413
9:24	412
9:24, 25	406
10:17, 18	423
11:29	413
12:6-8	473
12:7	523
14:10	643
14:14	324
14:17	613
15:26	512
16:16	548
16:20	321

I CORINTHIANS

1:2	224, 509, 548
1:10	548
1:13-17	557
1:16	171, 572
2:9	663
2:10, 11	228
2:11	284
3:4	547
3:16	227
5:7	389
5:13	512
6:19, 20	383
8:4	184
9:1	521
9:27	413
10:1, 2	562
10:13	267
10:16	576, 577
10:17	580, 582
11:19	579
11:20	576, 577
11:23	557
11:23-29	576
11:24	576, 577
11:26	577
11:33	512
12:3	481
12:4-11, 28-30	473
12:7	476, 484
12:9-30	493
12:13	476, 515
12:28	515, 527
12:30	483
13:8-10	660
14:1	476, 483
14:2	477
14:2, 5, 9	478
14:4	480
14:14	478
14:18	479
14:19	485
14:23	486
14:26	485
14:28	486
14:32	486
14:39	485
14:40	486
15:20	640
15:22	625
15:23	640
15:34	441
15:52	630
16:1	509, 512
16:3	518
16:15	572

II CORINTHIANS

3:17	185
4:17	395, 660
5:1	434
5:1, 6, 8	285
5:6-8	600
5:8	628
5:8, 11	295
5:10	223, 606
5:15	402
5:17	425
5:18	381
5:19-21	382
7:11	512
7:10	416
8:19	512
8:19, 23	518
12:2	285
12:8	224
13:14	213, 226

GALATIANS

1:1	515, 521
1:11-20	521
3:7	625
2:15	334
2:16	335
3:21	335
3:26	432
3:29	618
4:5	432
4:6	432
6:11	171

EPHESIANS

1:4, 5	411
1:17	383
1:22	508, 529
2:1	425, 623
2:3	334
2:8	414
2:15	629
2:18	215
2:19	432
2:21, 22	513

Chap. Verse Page

3:10, 21 508
3:15 513
4:3 548
4:7-12 473
4:11 522, 523, 525
4:11, 12 521
4:24 300
4:30 227
5:25, 26 456
5:26 459
5:25-27 508

PHILIPPIANS
1:1 512, 521, 523, 524, 525, 532
1:6 413
1:21 628
1:23 295
1:23, 24 285
1:21, 23, 24 601
2:6-9 360
2:7 369
2:8 423
3:20 634, 636
4:6 259
4:19 258

COLOSSIANS
1:13 616
1:16 265, 266
1:16, 17 223
1:18 508
2:13 623
2:14-22 557
2:16, 17 388
2:17 458
3:10 300

1 THESSALONIANS
2:10 447
3:13 636
4:14 636
4:14-17 628
4:16 630, 634, 636, 640
5:23 287, 457

2 THESSALONIANS
1:7-10 651
1:8 630
1:9 654, 657
2:3-8 536, 638
2:3-12 629
2:13 410
3:3 413

1 TIMOTHY
1:17 187, 657
2:3, 4 405
2:5 184
2:5, 6 383
2:6 378, 402
3:1, 2 524
3:1-13 521, 632
3:5 548
3:6 266
3:8-13 528
3:15 459, 510, 513
3:16 218, 360
4:1 540
5:9 512
5:10 588, 590
5:17 512, 529

2 TIMOTHY
1:12 413
2:15 617
3:16 167, 170, 171
4:1 644
4:5 522

TITUS
1:5 532
1:5-7 524
1:7 524
2:11 396, 442
2:13 636
3:5 424
3:5 459

HEBREWS
1:2 631
1:3 221, 223, 253
1:6 224
1:7 262, 263, 294
1:8 217
1:9 207
1:10 223
1:14 265
2:1-3 605
2:2 265
2:6, 7 294
2:7 294
2:7, 9 263
2:9 377, 379, 394, 402
2:12 508
2:14 358, 361
4:12 287
4:13 193
7:10 292
8:2 459
8:5 388, 458, 566
8:8 348
8:11 179
9:9 388, 458, 459
9:13, 14 378
9:14 215, 227, 657
9:23, 24 388
9:24 458, 460
9:28 378, 634
10:1 388, 458
10:10 423, 627
10:14 464
10:15 227
10:19-22 424, 459
10:22 568
10:25 512
10:29 227
11:13 601
12:9 185, 291
12:15 413
12:22 513
12:23 508
12:24 568
12:33 660
13:7 529
13:8 186, 220, 657
13:17 512

JAMES
1:17 186
2:24 417
5:14 532
5:14, 15 494, 496, 499

1 PETER
1:2 215, 410, 568
1:5 400, 413
1:12 264
1:15, 16 195
1:18, 19 383
1:19 388
1:23 424, 430, 468
2:5 513
2:21, 22 441
2:25 524
3:18 379
3:18-20 606
3:21 575
4:6 607
5:1, 2 525
5:11 524

2 PETER
1:10 413
1:13, 14 285
1:21 167, 171, 228
2:1 540
2:4 266, 646
2:9 643
3:4, 10 649
3:4-12 630
3:6-13 649
3:7 652
3:10 637

Chap. Verse	Page
3:13	663
3:16	108, 167
1 JOHN	
1:1, 2	360
1:7, 9	335
1:10	428
1:12, 13	430
2:1	441
2:2	381, 402, 403
2:4	442
2:18	629
2:29	430
3:1, 2	432
3:6	442
3:6, 9	441
3:9	430, 433
3:14	624, 434, 438
4:3	629, 366
4:6	434
4:7	430, 437
4:8	199
4:10	381
4:16	199
5:1	430, 574
5:7	214
5:11	602
5:18	430, 442
5:19	434
2 JOHN	
1	524
3 JOHN	
1	524
JUDE	
6	266
13	654
REVELATION	
1:5	378, 574
1:7	635
1:8	220
1:9	616
1:20	618
2:6	635
3:10	413
6:9-11	623
6:29	288
7:14	574
11:3	544
11:11-14	552
12:3	623
12:3, 4	622
12:5	623
12:9	321
13:14	546
14:1-9	551
14:11	654
15:3	196
17:10-12	622, 623
17:10, 12	618
18:1-4	552
19:1	660
19:6	188
19:11-16	622
20:1-6	621, 624, 625
20:2	321, 623
20:11	649
20:11-15	626, 645
20:12, 13	644
21:1	649
21:3	660
21:4	662
21:8	654

206-225

date due

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary

14265

DATE DUE

23 BT 75 .B97 1925 265
C5
Byrum, Russell R., 1888-
Christian theology

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BT75.B97 1925
Byrum, Russel Christian theology :
3 0645 0006 2543 0